DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 101 888 RC 008 322

AUTHOR Johnson, Deborah, Ed.; Moser, Collette, Ed.
TITLE Essays on the Public Employment Program in Rural Areas. Center for Rural Manpower and Public Affairs Special Paper No. 17.
INSTITUTION Michigan State Univ., East Lansing. Center for Rural Manpower and Public Affairs.
SPONS AGENCY Manpower Administration (DOL), Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE Oct 73
NOTE 95p.; For related documents, see RC 008 323 and 324

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.76 HC-$4.43 PLUS POSTAGE
DESCRIPTORS *Employment Problems; *Essays; Interagency Coordination; Local Government; Manpower Development; *Policy Formation; *Program Development; Research Proposals; Reservations (Indian); Revenue Sharing; *Rural Areas; Southern States; Unemployment
IDENTIFIERS Emergency Employment Act; *Public Employment Program

ABSTRACT

These eight essays on the Public Employment Program (PEP) were written by members of the Rural Manpower Policy Research Consortium. Essays are titled as follows: (1) "Public Service Employment and Manpower Policies in Rural Areas: Limitations of the Emergency Employment Act--EEA" (argument for integration of PEP with manpower, educational, and regional development policies); (2) "PEP: Special Problems of Rural Areas" (criticism of PEP's suitability to rural areas with a program proposal); (3) "Expansion of Needed Public Services in Rural Areas through Assistance from the EEA" (argument for integrated manpower programs and criticism of PEP); (4) "Public Employment in Rural Areas with Special Reference to the South" (contrast of EEA and Operation Mainstream); (5) "PEP Needs in the Rural South" (discussion of poverty, implicit and explicit barriers to public employment and analyzation of employment needs); (6) "EEA--Some Basic Policy Questions with Special Reference to American Indian Reservations" (4 policy considerations); (7) "Experience of the EEA in Balance-of-State Michigan: Some Implications for Revenue Sharing in Rural Areas" (comparison of EEA and revenue sharing programs); (8) "A Comparative Study of Public Service Employment in Rural California: A Proposal" (research proposal on PEP in balance-of-state California towns). (Author)

CENTER FOR RURAL MANPOWER & PUBLIC AFFAIRS

SPECIAL PAPER NO. 17 OCTOBER 1973

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

ESSAYS ON THE PUBLIC EMPLOYMENT PROGRAM IN RURAL AREAS

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRO-
DUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM
THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGIN-
ATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS
STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRE-
SENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

Edited by
Deborah Johnson
Collette Moser

Department of Agricultural Economics
College of Agriculture and
Natural Resources

MICHIGAN STATE UNIVERSITY
EAST LANSING, MICHIGAN 48824

0002

ED101888

RC008822

TABLE OF CONTENTS

		Page
Introduction		ii
Public Service Employment and Manpower Policies in Rural Areas: Limitations of the EEA	*Gerald G. Somers*	1
The Public Employment Program: Special Problems of Rural Areas	*Dale E. Mathaway*	9
Expansion of Needed Public Services in Rural Areas Through Assistance From the Emergency Employment Act of 1971	*Louis Levine*	16
Public Employment in Rural Areas With Special Reference to the South	*Ray Marshall*	23
Public Employment Program Needs in the Rural South	*Myrtle R. Reul*	26
Emergency Employment Act—Some Basic Policy Questions With Special Reference to American Indian Reservations	*Robert M. Hunter*	37
Experience of the Emergency Employment Act in Balance-of-State Michigan: Some Implications for Revenue Sharing in Rural Areas	*Collette H. Moser*	55
A Comparative Study of Public Service Employment in Rural California: A Proposal	*Varden Fuller*	86

0003

INTRODUCTION

These papers on the Public Employment Program (PEP) were written by members of the Rural Manpower Policy Research Consortium. The Consortium was formed late in 1971 under a contract from the Office of Research and Development, Manpower Administration, U.S. Department of Labor. The Center for Rural Manpower and Public Affairs at Michigan State University administers the project.

The eight-member Consortium consists of well-known academic researchers in the field of rural manpower activities. They represent different geographic areas and different academic disciplines. Consortium members help plan conferences on rural manpower development, and perform various research tasks. The Consortium meets periodically to discuss issues of concern to the Rural Manpower Service, U.S. Department of Labor.

Two of its meetings were concerned with the Public Employment Program in rural areas. Most of these papers were prepared as discussion papers for these meetings. The observations were made during the initial stages of PEP and were not meant to be definitive positions.

The PEP is authorized by the Emergency Employment Act (EEA) of 1971. The EEA became law on July 12, 1971, and funding was operational until June 30, 1973. The legislation has a dual function: to authorize direct public service employment possibilities for certain governmental units; and to serve as a counter-cyclical tool to combat high unemployment rates.

The U.S. Secretary of Labor administers the program. He is authorized to appropriate funds to state, county, and city governments with populations greater than 75,000 and to balance-of-state jurisdictions. Such funds are to be used to provide unemployed workers with transitional public service jobs, and communities with increased public services.

Funds are released when the national unemployment rate is greater than 4.5 percent for three consecutive months. Additional funds are available for areas which exhibit unemployment rates greater than 6 percent for three consecutive months. The relative level of unemployment determines the funding amount.

The EEA is considered by some as an experiment in revenue sharing. It provides for disbursement of federal funds to states and local units in the form of non-categorical grants. As a precursor of revenue sharing, the Consortium observations on PEP in rural areas are particularly relevant.

Although other reports such as that prepared by Sar Levitan for the Senate Subcommittee on Employment, Manpower and Poverty include references to the EEA in rural sections of particular states, none of these has analyzed separately issues of special concern to rural areas. By examining the traditional characteristics of rural areas and their past experiences with manpower programs, and by studying present empirical data on PEP, these papers attempt to analyze the particular problems of PEP in rural areas.

The first paper, by Gerald Somers, presents background information on the EEA. In so doing, it also explains the EEA's significance for rural areas. But Dr. Somers is not convinced that the EEA can adequately attack manpower problems in rural areas, and discusses the limitations of current policy. He believes public employment programs must be integrated with manpower, educational, and regional development policies.

Dale Hathaway is critical of PEP's suitability to rural areas. He discusses rural areas' special problems, characteristics, and needs. Based on this information, he presents a proposed program tailored to rural areas' needs.

Louis Levine contends rural areas are at a distinct disadvantage with urban areas in the competition for funds. As Dr. Somers, he believes manpower programs must be better integrated. He discusses several manpower programs and considers their integration with PEP.

Ray Marshall contrasts the experiences of the EEA and Operation Mainstream. He suggests specific activities which might be undertaken as rural public employment programs.

Myrtle Reul confines her discussion to the rural South. She begins by discussing the causes and state of rural Southern poverty. She then considers implicit and explicit barriers to public employment. She concludes by identifying and analyzing the rural South's public employment needs.

The last three papers consider empirical data on the PEP. Robert Hunter deals with the role of the PEP on Indian reservations. After summarizing federal policy toward Indian reservations, and Indians' reaction to federal policy, he defines four policy considerations: the temporary and transitional nature of PEP; the extent and use of Department of Labor supplied program guidelines; the lack of long-range planning; and the ill-defined relationship between the Bureau of Indian Affairs and the Department of Labor.

Collette Moser examines the experience of the EEA in balance-of-state Michigan. She finds most job openings were in low-level occupations while the EEA participants had education levels higher than the average in rural areas. She conducted interviews with EEA administrators and found, in general, a lack of planning and imagination. In the final section of her paper, she compares the experiences in rural areas of EEA with the new revenue sharing programs and finds similarities in the nature of the expenditures and the planning mechanism.

The last paper by Varden Fuller is actually a proposal. Dr. Fuller outlines a research proposal on PEP in balance-of-state California towns.

He is currently conducting similar research.

These papers were prepared with the encouragement of Dr. Daniel Sturt, Director of the Rural Manpower Service, U.S. Department of Labor, and Dr. John McCauley, Special Assistant. The research was supported by a grant from the U.S. Department of Labor through the Office of Research and Development, Manpower Administration.

Special thanks must be given to Jeanette Barbour for her excellent secretarial assistance.

Collette Moser, Director
Rural Manpower Policy Research Consortium

Deborah Kohn Johnson, Specialist
Center for Rural Manpower and Public Affairs

September, 1973

This report was prepared for the Manpower Administration, U.S. Department of Labor, under research and development Grant No. 21-26-73-52 authorized by Title I of the Manpower Development and Training Act. Since contractors performing such work under Government sponsorship are encouraged to express their own judgment freely, the report does not necessarily represent the Department's official opinion or policy. Moreover, the contractor is solely responsible for the factual accuracy of all material developed in the report.

PUBLIC SERVICE EMPLOYMENT AND MANPOWER POLICIES IN RURAL AREAS: LIMITATIONS OF THE EEA

Gerald G. Somers*

The Potential Significance of EEA for Rural Areas

The Emergency Employment Act of 1971 is a significant piece of legislation because of its magnitude and its portent for the future. Its budget of $1 billion for fiscal 1972 means that this program will account for 15 percent of manpower expenditures in its first year; this budget makes it by far the most significant piece of legislation since the 1930s designed for the creation of jobs in the public sector. Even its first year budget equals the combined expenditures for all other work experience and training programs for public employment, including Operation Mainstream, Public Service Careers, Work Incentive, and the Neighborhood Youth Corps. Expenditures of this size have the potential of a significant impact on rural areas.

The importance of EEA, however, is especially related to its probable future growth. It is likely to grow larger even in fiscal 1973 (for which EEA authorized $1.25 billion). There are proposals in Congress for a many-fold increase in public service employment over the 1972 budget. It is conceivable that public service employment will play the role in the 1970s that MDTA and related manpower policies played in the 1960s as a means of attacking the problems of unemployment.

The Emergency Employment Act provides an unusual opportunity for rural areas not only because of its current budget and probable growth, but also because it embodies features of decentralization which states and localities might utilize to give special assistance to rural areas. In this sense,

---

*Gerald G. Somers is Professor of Economics, University of Wisconsin.

it is the first of the "manpower" measures to embody the principles of decentralization which the current administration has been espousing through such measures as the revenue sharing proposals.

In spite of the potential benefits of public service employment for rural areas, there is little evidence that the current measures are providing significant aid to rural areas. Moreover, an expanded program of public service employment will not have a proportionate impact on rural areas unless departures are made from the design of the current program.

Limitations of the Current EEA in Attacking Manpower Problems in Rural Areas

Although it is not yet possible to make a full assessment of the functioning of EEA in rural areas, there is reason to believe that this approach to public service employment will do little to mitigate the hard-core unemployment problems of rural areas. A major increase in appropriations for public service employment would undoubtedly improve this situation. However, unless the current approach is significantly revised, the most serious unemployment problems in rural areas--especially in persistently depressed rural areas--are not likely to be met. The reasons for this view are as follows:

Underemployment in Rural Areas. As is well known, statistical data on officially-designated unemployment result in greater underestimation of "disguised unemployment" in rural areas than in urban areas. A larger proportion of workers in rural areas are underemployed than unemployed. Only 9 percent of the participants under Section 5 of the current Act were previously underemployed; and even under Section 6 of the Act, designed for areas with special problems of unemployment, only 10 percent of the EEA participants were underemployed as of January 7, 1972.

As has been found in the case of economic development legislation for rural areas, average per capita or family income is a more equitable criterion

of need in such areas than is the unemployment rate. Average income provides some rough measure of underemployment as well as unemployment. It is also notable that the characteristics of EEA participants under Section 6 of the Act are currently almost exactly the same as those under Section 5 with regard to age, sex, race, military status, disadvantaged status, welfare status, and previous unemployment. Thus, quite aside from the limited number of jobs which might be created in the most depressed rural areas under the present EEA approach, there is no evidence that the most needy in such areas are being assisted in proportion to their numbers in the rural population.

Hard-Core Unemployment in Rural Areas. The current legislation is designed to give preference to a number of conflicting groups. Although applicants must be unemployed or underemployed to qualify for EEA jobs, aid for the disadvantaged or hard-core unemployed is only one of a number of preferences listed. Most important is the fact that the Labor Department guidelines state that one-third of all participants should be Vietnam or Southeast Asia veterans. As a result, 30 percent of Section 5 and 20 percent of Section 6 participants are from this group even though Vietnam-era veterans constitute less than 7 percent of national unemployment.

The disadvantaged constitute only one-third of the enrollees, and welfare recipients represent only about 10 percent of the enrollees. As noted above, these proportions are roughly the same for Section 5 as for Section 6 which one would expect to include more of the persistently depressed rural areas.

Because of the preference given to Vietnam veterans, there has been a tendency to bypass workers under 21 and over 55. Indeed, only 6 percent of the Section 5 enrollees and 7 percent of the Section 6 enrollees have been 55 and over. Only 16 percent of all EEA hires have been under 21 or over 55. Yet in 1971 these two age groups represented 45 percent of national unemployment.

The current Act has also tended to bypass many of those who have the most serious educational handicaps in the labor market. Only 20 percent of the Section 5 enrollees and 25 percent of the Section 6 enrollees had less than 12 years of education.

The public service employment program was not primarily designed to aid the disadvantaged, and its tendency to bypass many of the disadvantaged affects urban as well as rural areas. However, the most persistent problems of unemployment and underemployment, especially for the relatively high proportion of older and younger workers, are most notable in rural areas. An Act which gives very high priority to such groups as Vietnam veterans and recently unemployed aerospace engineers is not likely to have a significant impact in solving the problems of hard-core unemployment in rural areas, especially where these problems have been persistent over lengthy periods of time.

The bypassing of the hard-core unemployed in rural areas by EEA parallels a similar experience under other legislation designed to foster employment opportunities in developing rural areas. Studies have indicated that new and expanding plants, induced to invest or locate in rural areas under a variety of federal, state, and local programs, have done little to improve the employment of the least educated, the least skilled, and the aged. New jobs in private industry are more likely to go to the most advantaged in the local labor market or to in-migrants and return migrants from other areas. Similarly, governmental labor mobility programs have favored those in the prime age groups rather than older workers with serious employment disadvantages.[1]

---

[1]Gerald G. Somers, Employment Effects of Plant Expansions and Accelerated Public Works in Rural Redevelopment Areas, (Madison, Wisconsin: Industrial Relations Research Institute, University of Wisconsin, 1971).

Accelerated Public Works have provided employment for older workers and other disadvantaged workers in depressed rural areas in forest redevelopment and similar programs. However, this type of public employment needs expansion; it could serve as a major source of jobs and income in rural areas only through significant modifications in the EEA approach.

The Need for Training in Rural Areas. Only $42 million of the $1 billion budget of EEA for fiscal 1972 is to be allocated to training and manpower services. Given the relatively small share of the total EEA budget which will end up in rural areas, the training allocation in rural areas is likely to be insignificant. And yet the need for skill development in such areas is great. The development of occupational skills can serve as a major inducement to new industrial facilities. Most of the jobs which are open in rural governmental units require skills which are beyond those of the hard-core unemployed. Such programs as Operation Mainstream and New Careers have been successful in their limited sphere of operation, but their magnitude has been too small to further the skill development and occupational mobility required for absorption of the rural poor into the labor market.

The development of skills through training among the rural unemployed would serve a dual purpose. It would help provide the expertise needed in such areas for the development of infrastructure and for raising the quality of rural life. And it would provide rural workers with skills that might be transferred from the public sector to private industry when private industrial development is encouraged by other means.

The Limited Nature of Current Manpower Programs in Rural Areas. One can readily list the current federal manpower programs which could potentially reduce hard-core unemployment in rural areas. Certainly, MDTA Institutional and OJT Training, the Concentrated Employment Program, the Neighborhood Youth

Corps, the Work Incentive Program, Operation Mainstream, and Public Service Careers could all do wonders for the employment opportunities of disadvantaged rural workers. The fact is, however, that they have not made a major contribution to employment in such areas. This failure stems partly from lack of organization and lack of political clout. However, the limited effect of manpower programs in rural areas is primarily a result of a lack of job opportunities in such areas. The manpower programs listed above prepare workers for jobs; they do not create jobs.

Thus, even though EEA is supposed to give preference to graduates of manpower programs, the limited development of such programs in rural areas to date offers little hope that a firm linkage between manpower policies and public service employment will develop without a more specific mandate in revised legislation.

The Need to Integrate Public Employment with Manpower, Educational, and Regional Development Policies

One of the major lessons of the 1960s is that isolated manpower programs are likely to be ineffective in furthering employment and income. Manpower policies must be integrated with educational programs and other economic policies if the welfare of the disadvantaged is to be materially improved. This is especially true in rural areas.

Legislation such as the current EEA, even if expanded in budget, will do little to further the employment and income of those in rural areas who are most in need of assistance. Current manpower programs will be of little aid in the absence of jobs in rural areas. Many of the hard-core older unemployed in rural areas need basic literacy education before they can hope to make a meaningful contribution to the labor market. Private industry is reluctant to move into depressed rural areas in the absence of an educated and skilled work force.

Public service employment can serve as the fulcrum by which manpower policy, basic education, and area redevelopment can be integrated to further employment, income, and the quality of life in rural areas. Occupational skill training, under a variety of current programs, can be effective if it is closely integrated with the creation of new jobs in the public sector. At the same time, the skills developed through training programs and experience in public employment can serve as a major inducement to private industry to locate in rural areas. Basic literacy education, taken by itself, has done little to improve employment opportunities of functional illiterates. But when closely integrated with occupational training, on the job or in close connection with a job, it has proved to be a significant step forward. These integrated policies can not only serve to further employment and income in rural areas, but the skills and experience that result from them can serve to improve the infrastructure and quality of rural life.

It should be noted, however, that the required integration of public employment, manpower policies, educational policies, and area development will not come about without specific provisions designed to achieve such integration. The mere parallel existence of such programs does not assure their integration. More must be done than the present EEA stipulation of a vague preference for the graduates of manpower programs along with many other preferences. A much larger proportion of an expanded EEA budget for rural areas should be ear-marked for training, retraining, basic education, and other manpower services. Upgrading through the training of present personnel in the agencies of rural areas should be accompanied by a specification of manpower and education services for the hard-core unemployed so that they may take their place on the beginning rung of the occupational ladder in public employment.

If EEA is to make a significant contribution to employment and income in rural areas, it must provide job opportunities that are more than temporary and transitory. Career opportunities in public service are possible only if job creation is accompanied by programs for skill development. Skill development for careers in public service will also constitute the surest attraction for private industry in rural areas.

THE PUBLIC EMPLOYMENT PROGRAM: SPECIAL PROBLEMS OF RURAL AREAS

Dale E. Hathaway*

The present Public Employment Program has been well received by local officials and there is considerable pressure to expand it. However, the program is not well suited to the nation's rural areas, and major program modifications are needed in order for it to function with full effectiveness. What follows is: (1) a discussion of the special problems and characteristics of rural areas and their residents, (2) a discussion of rural areas' special needs, and (3) suggestions for a special program tailored to these needs.

Special Problems and Characteristics of Rural Areas and Their Residents

The present formula used to allocate funds discriminates against rural areas. The use of unemployment statistics as a basis of allocation discriminates in two ways. First, the unemployment figures for rural areas are based upon a formula which uses covered employment statistics. Many rural jobs are not covered under unemployment insurance due to employment in noncovered occupations and size of business. Thus, the unemployment rate in rural areas clearly is underestimated. Second, the formula takes no account of the widespread underemployment in rural areas which is much more common than in urban areas. Nor does it reflect the low labor force participation by some groups. The low income levels in rural areas are actually a better indication of economic welfare than are unemployment statistics. In fact, unemployment insurance and/or welfare payments in urban areas often exceed the income of "employed" persons in rural areas.

---

*Dale E. Hathaway is Professor of Agricultural Economics, Michigan State University, on leave as Program Advisor in Agriculture, Asia and Pacific Program, Ford Foundation, New York.

Many rural areas are almost devoid of functioning government. Often the only full-time public employees in rural counties work in the sheriff's department, the county clerk's office, the school system, and the agricultural extension service. Most, if not all, of the policy-making officials in the county or village government are part-time employees, skilled neither in government nor in manpower planning. These officials lack professional staff for planning purposes and often are unaware of the existence of state and federal programs which could fund pressing needs. Moreover, even if they knew of such programs, they probably would lack the expertise to fill out the applications and do the necessary follow-up work.

Public services are deficient. Public or private health services, useful vocational education, employment services, vocational rehabilitation, public housing, welfare programs, and numerous other services that are prominent in urban areas often are inadequate or even nonexistent in rural areas. In addition, rural areas lack the numerous private organizations that play significant roles in urban areas such as the Chamber of Commerce, Community Chest, YMCA, YWCA, etc.

There is also a lack of public infrastructure. Public transportation is unknown, libraries and museums are rare, and water and sewage treatment facilities are usually lacking or inadequate. This makes these areas less desirable for location of private industry. And as previously mentioned, federal and state funds to build infrastructure are unknown and unused due to the lack of effective local government.

The local revenue base is inadequate and cannot provide the needed public services. Moreover, there is little future prospect of improvement from local sources. These units are solely dependent upon property taxes which are already above the breaking point in most rural areas. This is evidenced

by the chronic defeat of school tax renewals or tax increases in these areas.

There are few private nonfarm employers. At a time when farm employment is dropping rapidly there is not and will not be an offsetting influx of nonfarm employers. Many of the employers in rural areas are marginal low-wage industries. When viable high-wage industries do move in, they often import their labor force or cream the local labor market. Consequently, new enterprises have relatively little impact upon upgrading the quality of the labor force, and usually do not add to rural income. This problem is intensified by the preceding ones.

The age distribution of the population is skewed. Rural areas have higher proportions of persons under 21 and over 45 than do urban areas. This means they have many new labor market entrants with no work experience and many older workers whose prospects for private employment are dim. Thus, a program that concentrates on Vietnam veterans cuts out both groups and touches only a small part of the population.

The educational level of the population is low in terms of years of school and quality of schooling. Many of the older residents, especially the non-whites, are functional illiterates. But illiteracy is not confined to this group. Thus in rural areas the labor force is not temporarily unemployed because of cyclical shifts. Rather the population has been and will be chronically unemployed and underemployed. Governments do not have a full array of public service functions. Instead they offer limited public services. And finally, governments are not fully and adequately staffed by full-time professionals; rural governments exist more on paper than in reality.

It is in this situation that the Public Employment Program has functioned. In general, the result often has been a duplication of existing services rather than a plan for the services most needed. The program has placed

people in dead-end jobs with little chance of moving to private employment and has creamed the local labor market in the process. As is the case with most federal manpower programs, this one was designed by and for urban people and falls far short of the needs of rural residents.

What Needs to be Done in Rural Areas?

A first priority in rural areas is the installation of full-time competence in rural government in the area of human and community resource development and planning. Unless more effective planning and coordination of existing and future public programs can be achieved in these areas, there is little prospect of the effective use of outside funds. This is fundamental, not only in manpower programs, but to the entire concept of revenue sharing. *Local people do not inherently recognize their problems and maximize the use of whatever funds are available to them.* To do so requires competent information gathering, realistic appraisal of alternatives and their potential benefits, and full-time attention to the total community resource and needs.

There must be a substantial increase in the investment in the area's human resources. Schools need more teachers, teacher's aides, counselors, and special education programs. Law enforcement agencies need more juvenile corrections and rehabilitation workers. Health services need more professionals and paraprofessionals to provide even minimum health services. Adult literacy programs are needed for minorities and for the general adult population who cannot hope to compete in the modern labor market without these basic skills. The Employment Service needs full service offices in rural areas to tie rural people to local and outside labor markets. Vocational schools and training programs are needed to teach basic salable skills outside of agriculture. Most rural areas lack part or all of these human development services at the present time.

The level of living of those rural residents who are not now or never will be viable in the labor market must also be improved. These are primarily, but not exclusively, the aged. This implies health services for the aged and chronically ill, nursing homes, etc.

Local private groups, such as cooperatives, should be organized to improve the economic well-being of low income rural residents. Such groups could focus on housing, consumer goods, producer goods, and some of the needed services.

In summary, the emphasis in rural areas must be toward human development. Without this the people will not be viable workers in eitner local or urban labor markets. Without accompanying human development, physical and natural resource development cannot improve the human welfare of the rural disadvantaged. The alternative is to forget the human investment and merely enlarge the public dole, a policy that is expensive and inhumane.

A Proposed Special Public Services Employment Program for Rural Areas

A new supplementary PEP for all areas should be proposed, with its primary emphasis on rural areas. It should have the following criteria:

1. The monetary allocations to states and counties should be based upon:
   a) median family income.
   b) median level of education.
2. The criteria should require a full-time human resource program planner and coordinator who could be a part of the county government, the Rural Manpower Service, or the Cooperative Extension Service. The position should be funded six months or more in advance of the rest of the program allocation's release. This person would be expected to produce a plan of need showing relative positions of public

service functions in the area (schools, vocational education, health, etc.) and present priorities for funding based upon these relative needs. These priorities would then determine the number and types of positions to be filled from these funds.

3. The special program should concentrate on job slots that are clearly human development jobs, i.e., teachers and aides, not janitors or bus drivers. Adequate training funds and programs should be authorized to supplement the job slots so that most positions could be filled by local people. The funding priorities plan should specify jobs and training needs.
4. The temporary time limits on such positions should be removed and they should be continued as long as Congress authorizes the special program. At least a decade of such a program is needed regardless of the unemployment level as measured by current statistics.
5. The program's target will be the improvement of all disadvantaged rural residents, not merely those fortunate enough to be employed under it. Therefore, the total specification of job slots for special groups (veterans, disadvantaged, etc.) should be relaxed in order to obtain the higher level professionals needed in certain jobs such as planning, health, etc.
6. An average of at least ten persons per rural county should be included under this special program. According to the Department of Labor, there are approximately 2,000 rural counties in the U.S. This implies 20,000 job slots. Since wages are much lower in rural areas, especially in the South where the program impact would be greatest, these positions probably could be filled for $6,000 per position. Thus, the total program cost could be about $120 million plus administrative cost. The training costs would be in addition.

7. The program criteria and administration should be done by or in conjunction with the new Rural Manpower Service at the federal and state level.

The Public Employment Program as outlined above could have a lasting impact on rural America. It would not be a make-work or relief program but a basic investment in rural people and their governments. Without such investment the concept of revenue sharing in rural America will be a sham, if not a shambles.

EXPANSION OF NEEDED PUBLIC SERVICES IN RURAL AREAS THROUGH ASSISTANCE FROM THE EMERGENCY EMPLOYMENT ACT OF 1971

Louis Levine*

Qualifying for Financial Assistance

Rural areas or counties, whose populations are scattered and whose labor markets lack structure and organization, are typically at a distinct disadvantage in competing with urban areas in the state for financial assistance under the provisions of the Emergency Employment Act of 1971 (EEA). Such areas suffer from an inherent and traditional attitude of self-sufficiency which regards nonlocal assistance and public expenditures with skepticism, suspicion, and sometimes outright opposition. Moreover, the lack of an infrastructure in rural areas together with severely limited public service organization, resources, and facilities makes them poor claimants for financial assistance even when they are inclined to seek such assistance. This situation is aggravated by the fact that justification for such assistance may need to be established on the basis of requirements in more than one local rural area or county and so will necessitate group participation and cooperative effort.

A case may well be made that a prerequisite to EEA assistance is a determination of the geographic limits of the rural area—whether it be a group of rural counties, a district or section of the state, or a "functional economic area"—which is in need of assistance. Closely tied in with this step is the designation of a "senior program analyst" who can serve as a staff arm to the rural area executives, county commissioners, or boards of supervisors. Perhaps such a position should be included in any early request for EEA assistance. This position includes the following duties: the assessment of needed human resources and manpower program services in the area; an inventory and

---

*Louis Levine is Professorial Lecturer, The School of Government and Business Administration, George Washington University.

exploration of various federal and state types of assistance which may be meaningful for the area; and the preparation of appropriate technical materials and supporting documents to demonstrate that the area qualifies for financial assistance. Even with such a position, there will be considerable need for technical assistance and services outside the local rural area. The central administrative office of the state manpower agency may have specialized technical competences which need to be drawn upon as a part of an action program designed to provide technical services and assistance on rural manpower problems to rural areas within the state.

It is especially important to recognize that existing definitions of unemployment, established techniques for conducting labor force and unemployment surveys, and methods of estimating unemployment are disadvantageous to rural areas. They tend to lose sight of hidden or disguised unemployment and underemployment, which are more common to rural than urban areas. As a consequence, even if technical, statistical, and analytical competences were available locally, on the basis of unemployment criteria, rural areas would be less likely than urban areas to qualify for EEA assistance. Consideration needs to be given to how unemployment estimates may more adequately reflect labor force participation rates and experiences unique to rural areas. At the same time, simplified formulae for making these estimates must be introduced so that technical requirements will not exceed the capabilities of personnel in rural areas.

Another factor which significantly limits rural area participation in EEA financial assistance is the residual character of the allocation of funds to a "balance-of-the-state" after urban area allocations; highest priority tends to be assigned to urban areas. The Governor, as the chief state executive in the allocation of EEA balance-of-state funds, is often confronted by

claims from a powerful bureaucracy at the state level to expand the number of positions at central administrative offices. The rationalization for such expansion is that services will be provided more economically and efficiently than if personnel were responsible to local rural government authority. When services to a rural area can be provided best by outstationed and locally responsible personnel, it becomes important to demonstrate that such services are required on a full-time basis. In such instances, establishing needs on a district or sectional basis and involving the participation of several rural areas or counties as a single group claimant, is a significant consideration. Experiences of the Coordinated Area Manpower Planning System (CAMPS), now referred to as Area Manpower Planning Council, may be especially relevant.

Linkages to On-going Manpower Programs

In order to maximize the potential of EEA assistance for advancing manpower objectives in rural areas, agency resources and techniques and existing manpower programs and services must be used effectively. The manpower program is characterized by numerous specialized categories to which services are directed and by highly fragmented services: one cannot exaggerate the importance of linkages and interfacing with rural manpower needs and services. Failure to take this into account creates the risk of isolation and compartmentalization with consequent reduced services to human resources and manpower in rural areas. Furthermore, it limits the access to EEA assistance.

The emphasis assigned to improvement of employability services in the manpower program during the past decade has greatly detracted from rural manpower programs and services. Rural manpower programs also have been hindered by an urban focus on inner-city dwellers, the disadvantaged, and racial minorities. It will take more than EEA assistance to reverse this experience and establish needed program balance between urban and rural areas.

Fragmentation of manpower programs and excessive reliance on specialized categories of clientele—the poor, disadvantaged, Blacks, Indians, Chicanos, Puerto Ricans, etc.—can and does become self-defeating. It even may lead to counter-productive, wasteful, competitive effort. The magnitude and character of manpower programs and services in rural areas must be determined by a factual diagnosis of the manpower problems and needs: these may differ considerably from one rural area to another. Establishing manpower programs for predetermined categories of clientele in rural areas will inevitably give rise to conflicts with manpower programs in urban areas.

The first action which the state manpower agency (through the Employment Service) can take to assure the availability of relevant manpower services to rural areas is to put its own house in order. A relatively high level supervisory or management person in the Rural Manpower Program in the state agency should be responsible for having a thorough knowledge of on-going manpower programs. This individual should keep up-to-date on program changes and should identify those programs which should be closely linked with rural manpower services. In a sense, this individual could act as the spokesman for the rural areas—both as a liaison and coordinator—with other elements of the Employment Service. In terms of the Public Employment Program (PEP) in rural areas, this position not only interfaces with other manpower programs but also serves an intermediary function, assuring that needed technical assistance and services are available to local rural government and public service agencies.

Even within the context of current Rural Manpower Service program activities, consideration needs to be given to their interface with PEP potential in rural areas. For example, the Area Concept Expansion Program (Ottumwa-Type) in remote rural areas may provide the basis for the geographic framework

or model (involving multiple rural county participation) for introducing new or increasing existing public services. Similarly, the Smaller Communities Program includes elements for providing mobile teams of manpower service specialists in remote rural areas. This program generally is in effect only for three months in a particular area; program experiences may indicate the need for greater continuity with the assistance of PEP. The Concerted Services in Training and Education (CSTE) may justify expansion of staff resources through PEP as it requires interagency effort to develop additional education and training in rural areas. At the same time, this activity can be useful in the development of needed qualified personnel for public service employment in rural areas.

Unfortunately, Manpower Development and Training (MDT) and the Rural Concentrated Employment Program (CEP) are neither deep rooted nor widespread. Consequently, they are under-represented in manpower programs generally. Nevertheless, experience based on both of these programs and especially on rural CEP can contribute to PEP in rural areas which involves training and supportive services through cooperative efforts of several agencies. Somewhat similar implications may be found in the experience of Operation Mainstream Program which is designed to assist chronically unemployed people, especially older persons, in rural areas and small towns. An effective blending of the last three enumerated programs with PEP could establish a work force of aides and lesser skilled workers, who could come under the supervision of a position supplied by PEP, to provide needed public services in a rural area.

In the year before the enactment of the Emergency Employment Act, the Public Service Careers (PSC) Program seems to have had relatively little importance in rural areas. Yet, properly linked with PEP, this program could

be especially relevant for rural areas. Three plans in this program can contribute significantly to training and employment of public service personnel in rural areas:

Plan A - Covers the entry and upgrading of employees on low incomes in state, county, and local government. It also provides for extraordinary costs of hiring and training.

Plan B - Includes employment and upgrading in grant-in-aid programs sponsored by state, county, and local government agencies and in independent special districts.

Plan C - Deals with new careers in human service sponsored by governmental and private non-profit agencies in the human service fields.

Many indexes point to the interdependence of rural and urban economies: the dovetailing of employment and earnings from farm, rural nonfarm, and urban activities; the population shift to towns and cities; the out-migration of rural youth in search of urban employment; etc. Adequate manpower services in rural areas call for a greater interrelationship of experience, information, techniques, and services between rural and urban segments of the public employment service. Because of the changing character of industrial activities (the shift to trade and service and from private to public) and the consequent changes in the occupational composition of the work force, increasing attention must be directed to manpower services related to public service employment in rural areas.

Advances in communication technology, computerization, and record-keeping processes are beginning to have a major impact on manpower services and activities of the various interested agencies. The Job Bank, a listing of job openings, links urban and rural areas through electronic data processing.

For those living in rural areas, access to job market information and employment opportunities in urban areas introduces new dimensions to rural manpower services. Such access is likely to create new demands for public services in rural areas. These developments necessitate an understanding of the common interests and cooperative efforts required on the part of personnel engaged in providing manpower services in rural areas and public service agencies in such areas. The extent to which PEP can contribute to this process is a major consideration.

Community, Supportive, and Rehabilitative Services

The optimum development and utilization of manpower resources in rural areas is probably more likely to be achieved through community, supportive, and rehabilitative services than through direct manpower and job market services. In other words, educational and training facilities, social and health services, and cultural and recreational resources are the most important forces shaping the skills and competences of the rural population and labor force. They determine the extent to which employment absorption in a favorable economic environment may take place. Clearly, public service agencies, activities, and services in rural areas now have greater significance than ever before. Thus schools, skill training centers, hospitals, and medical service clinics—yes, swimming pools, recreation centers, and athletic fields—become key elements in the economic growth and development of rural areas. Greater industrialization and better economic balance (including plant location considerations) for rural areas involve more than the number and skills of available workers. In this connection, community facilities—roads and highways, police protection, fire protection, and sanitation—take on new importance and emphasize public service employment needs in rural areas.

PUBLIC EMPLOYMENT IN RURAL AREAS WITH SPECIAL REFERENCE TO THE SOUTH

Ray Marshall*

Although I will attempt to be national in my remarks, they undoubtedly will reflect my preoccupation with the rural South.

Public employment is necessary because of the heavy displacement of people from agriculture who are not likely to benefit from migration or industrialization, both of which are beneficial mainly to younger, better educated workers. Industrialization of rural areas has done relatively little for the disadvantaged because private profit-making employers either cream local populations or bring their employees with them when they move into rural areas. In the latter case, many are people who have migrated out of rural areas, but who are willing to return to their former homes when the opportunity presents itself. As a consequence, unemployment, underemployment, and rural-urban income differentials have not changed much due to migration (including relocation projects) or industrialization.

Perhaps restrictions should be placed on the hiring practices of subsidized firms or on public-supported corporations or cooperatives so that the rural unemployed and underemployed receive jobs opening up in rural areas.

The main public employment programs to date, the EEA and Operation Mainstream, seem to have been most significant. However, EEA has had little impact on the disadvantaged in rural areas; few slots have been created in rural areas and the program has hired few rural disadvantaged. Nationwide, only 7 percent of EEA jobs went to people with less than a high school education. Although education is not always a good measure of "disadvantaged," it may be better than any other.

---

*Ray Marshall is Professor of Economics, and Director of the Center for the Study of Human Resources, University of Texas.

A number of features of the EEA limit its ability to reach the rural disadvantaged: (1) Use of the unemployment rate as an allocating mechanism discriminates against rural areas, where much of the unemployment is not measured; (2) The EEA requires the minimum wage be paid. Rural governments resist this requirement since many rural employees are paid below the minimum wage. Filling EEA slots at above the minimum would thus either create inequities or cause the government's wage bill to increase beyond acceptable limits; (3) EEA is administered by local governmental units who, like private profit-making employers, have little interest in hiring the disadvantaged.

Operation Mainstream, on the other hand, is carried out by private organizations with an interest in giving jobs to the unemployed and underemployed in rural areas. Although there have been problems with this program, they apparently have been due to personnel and administrative failures, not conceptual defects. As a consequence, Operation Mainstream has put people to work who otherwise probably would have been unemployed; the people have done useful visible work; and the administrative arrangement has not threatened existing governmental units. Since we are still in the process of studying Operation Mainstream and EEA, these conclusions are somewhat tentative. But from preliminary conclusions, I believe any expansion of the EEA program should consider some Operation Mainstream-type activities as part of the program mix.

Specific Kinds of Activities for Rural Public Employment

Rural populations tend to be residual with large dependency ratios. Therefore, public employment needs a heavy service component to provide care for the very young and the very old: health care, day care, nursing homes, and burial activities are particularly important. Such care could be provided by community corporations and cooperatives and would be profitable if

income maintenance were adopted. In the latter case, families and individuals would have more funds to pay for the services.

Many displaced farmers and agricultural workers could utilize their agricultural experiences in ecological and environmental programs--cleaning up waterways, building park and recreation areas, improving roads and highways, and providing better waste disposal facilities for rural areas. Perhaps some displaced farmers with superior agricultural knowledge could be used in technical assistance programs to help small farmers survive. Others might render technical assistance to cooperatives and other voluntary associations designed to give the rural poor a voice in public policy as well as helping to improve incomes.

This list could be extended, but it provides an idea of the kinds of things that might be done. There is no shortage of jobs to be done or people to do them. What is needed is an adequate program and local program administrator. The latter will be in short supply and therefore should receive high priority in any public employment program.

PUBLIC EMPLOYMENT PROGRAM NEEDS IN THE RURAL SOUTH

Myrtle R. Reul*

The South by Definition

Just as the word "rural," the word "South" has been defined in different ways. In many studies, data on the South have been examined for a 16-state area using the Census Bureau's listing of Southern states; in others the 10 states of the Confederacy or 8 states in the Southeast region are used. Although the Mason-Dixon Line is usually considered the northern boundary of the South, Maryland and Delaware are more properly thought of as part of the Megalopolis, which sprawls from Boston to Washington. Similarly, west Texas is actually part of the Southwest and north Missouri is usually considered to be part of the Midwest. In some studies, Florida is excluded on the basis that it is not characteristically a Southern state. In looking at the South and especially at the Southeast, the grouping of states is most important. The material in this report applies primarily to Alabama, Florida, Georgia, Kentucky, Mississippi, North Carolina, South Carolina, and Tennessee, and to a lesser degree also applies to Louisiana, Virginia, and West Virginia.

The Population and Poverty

According to the Bureau of Census, almost one-fourth of the nation's population lives in the South and a large percentage are poor. In fact, almost one-half of the nation's poor resides in the South.[1] Roughly 13 of every 100 whites and 41 of every 100 blacks are poor in the South. Moreover, 63 percent of all blacks, and 65 percent of all whites in poverty in the

AP00023

---

*Myrtle R. Reul is Assistant Dean of the School of Social Work, and Professor of Social Work, University of Georgia.

[1]United States Department of Commerce, Bureau of Census, Consumer Income, C.P.S. P-60, No. 76 (1970), 72.

South reside in rural areas.[2]

The New York Times Encyclopedic Almanac, 1970 gives the percentages of poor within each state and tells what percent live in rural areas. A sample of this information reveals that several of the states of the South have large rural poor populations.

> Alabama poor people in the state 34.9 percent of the total population; 57.6 percent of the poor live in rural areas.
>
> Kentucky poor people in the state 29.7 percent of the total population; 71.7 percent of the poor live in rural areas.
>
> North Carolina poor people in the state 32.2 percent of the total population; 70.5 percent of the poor live in rural areas.

As is true in all areas of our nation, the largest number of poor in the South is white; but the percentage of poor as compared with the total number in the population is much higher among nonwhites.

Census data indicate that the rural South has a larger proportion of families headed by females than the nation as a whole. Because of the lower incomes for women in the South (whether working or on welfare) female-headed families often have incomes below $3,000 (in 1959 dollars). Nationwide, about 57 percent of all white female-headed families and 81 percent of nonwhite female-headed families have an income of less than $3,000. In the rural South, 75 percent of all female-headed white families have an income of less than $3,000 and 90 percent of the female-headed nonwhite families are in that position.

Poverty is also reflected in food habits. According to a recent evaluation, food consumption habits are changing in the rural South. These changes bode badly for the nutrition of residents of these areas. Utilizing data

---

[2]United States Department of Commerce, Bureau of Census, Current Population Reports: Special Studies, C.P.S. P-23, No. 33, (1970), 73.

to form trends, the report shows that farm families in rural Georgia and Mississippi produced 60-70 percent of the food they consumed in 1935-36 but this figure dropped to 40 percent in 1955 and to 25 percent in 1965.[3] From personal observation I believe gardens in the rural South have decreased even more in the 1970s.

Certain basic foods have been greatly affected. While 60 percent of farm families produced their own milk in 1955, only 30 percent did so by 1965. The rural poor who are in the lowest third of the income distribution consumed on the average one pound less meat, fish, and poultry per week in 1965 than they did in 1955. Trends indicate the diets of rural residents are deteriorating rapidly.[4]

Of the 21 states with "poverty counties" as defined in 1970 by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, the Department of Agriculture, and the Office of Economic Opportunity, all southeastern states had certain counties which were eligible for food stamps or commodity distribution programs.

Having been the chairman of the Family Service subgroup of the Social Development Section of the Governor's Goals for Georgia in 1971, I had an opportunity to see rural poverty first-hand. In the rural areas of Georgia, we found that low-income citizens were not well organized and had few spokesmen to articulate their problems and needs. Specifically, they need to improve transportation, housing, education, health service, community development, and income maintenance.

---

[3]F. Clark, "Trends in Food Consumption in the South," The Food Problems of Georgia, ed. by G. G. Dull (Athens: ICON, 1970).

[4]Ibid.

Many of the small communities in those rural counties have been unable to keep pace with the changing economic and social fabric of some of the more prosperous communities. Accordingly, those communities that formerly provided services to rural families had their economic base eroded. The result of this condition has left those communities and their populations trapped in poverty.

There is extensive unemployment and underemployment in Georgia's rural areas. The problem of overcoming poverty is complicated by the fact that many have lost almost all hopes of improving their situation. Some have attempted to keep up with the technological changes in farming and have failed. Others have attempted to obtain employment outside of agriculture, forestry, and related areas but have been unsuccessful due to a basic lack of requisite skills for modern industry.

There is a need for training and retraining; training as fundamental as learning how to read and write. The kind and quality of educational and manpower training services that will provide these people with skills that will enable them to secure adequate jobs must be developed.

In a 12-county rural area in mid-Georgia with a population of 52,313 families, in 1971, 45 percent had an annual income of less than $3,000 regardless of family size. These impoverished people are trapped. Many lack money because they are not steadily employed: their unemployment is due to a lack of training and necessary skills. Others are not trained because they lack the opportunity to learn. Many lack the desire and may need motivational help, but little is available.

Employment and Transportation

The availability of employment is compounded by the great distance many rural people live from such employment. Most of these people have no

transportation of their own, and public transportation is not available.

Housing

There have been few zoning laws and building regulations in the South's rural areas. Today the largest number of ill-housed individuals and families in the United States live in the Southeast, where in some states 40-50 percent of all housing is substandard. In most rural areas, the potential home buyer in the less than $15,000 price range has little choice except to buy a mobile home if permitted by local government. But many mobile homes are poorly constructed, over-priced, and too small for the needs of large families.

Health Services

According to Time magazine, there are at least 5,000 rural communities in the country that lack access to a doctor.[5] In the rural South, many total counties or groups of counties do not have a physician or registered nurse living or working within the area. In general, the South appears to be keeping pace with national rates for hospital beds per 1,000 population, while falling behind national rates in providing nursing home facilities.[6] At the same time, neighborhood health centers are extremely rare. In 1968, there were only five such centers serving the South's rural areas.

Every state in the South is well below national averages in professional health manpower per 100,000 population. The lone exception is the large number of registered nurses practicing in Florida. Only Florida and Tennessee have more doctors than the Medical Association's minimum estimate of 100 doctors per 100,000 people needed to deliver adequate health care.[7] With few

---

[5]Time, January 18, 1971, p. 35.

[6]United States Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, S.S.A. Health Insurance Statistics, (1971).

[7]K. Terjen, "Uneasy Peace Reigns in Delta Schools: Gimmickry Starves Welfare Program," South Today, II, (November 4, 1970), p. 2.

exceptions, the production of health service professionals within these states is not adequate. Mississippi provides a striking example. In 1968, it produced no dentists, only 17 registered nurses, and 65 medical and osteopathic doctors. Health needs are very apparent in rural areas in all Southern states.

Education

It has been estimated that it takes a base of 3,500 people to provide the tax revenue to economically run a school. In many Southern states, up to 95 percent of local school revenues are derived from one form of local property tax or another. Shrinking populations in some rural areas, lack of industry or business to offset the tax, increasing numbers of private schools, and heavily poverty stricken areas all add to the crisis facing rural education in the South.

Welfare

In the four federally aided public assistance programs—Aid to the Aged, Aid to the Blind, Aid to the Disabled, and Aid to the Families of Dependent Children—Southern states are unable to finance appropriations sufficient to match states in the North and West. Grants under these programs are much lower in the South than any place other than Puerto Rico. In no Southern state do the basic need formulas used to compute monthly benefits yield a figure exceeding the Orshansky poverty line for female-headed households of a given size. And the South does not have a low cost of living. Using Georgia as an example to point up some of the inequities in income maintenance arrangements found throughout the South, we see:

> A retired worker 65 or older covered by OASDI can receive monthly benefits up to $272 depending on his average yearly earning. If average yearly earnings were $4,200, monthly benefits would be $178. A retired worker age 65, not insured under OASDI may qualify for Georgia Old Age assistance and receive a maximum of $91 a month.

> A minor child whose father deserts would be eligible for Aid to the Families of Dependent Children. A child whose father dies is eligible for Social Security (OASDI). In the first instance, the child has the burden of being a welfare recipient; in the latter, there is the security of being "insured." The deserted mother and child can receive maximum monthly AFDC benefits of $79. For the insured family, the monthly benefits may run as high as $414.
>
> A domestic or agricultural worker injured on the job is not entitled to Workmen's Compensation, while a laundry worker (where 10 or more are employed) can receive 60 percent of his weekly wages--up to $50.

In many counties of the South, there is little public assistance. In Georgia, more than half of the 159 counties have almost no public assistance for an individual or family who does not qualify for categorical relief involving federal monies.

Labor Force

There are proportionately more young boys and old men in the Southern male labor force than are to be found in the working population of any other section of the country. There are two main reasons:

(1) Short educations result in youths joining the working force earlier. This is coupled with the pattern of sons following their fathers into work in the mines or mills, and both sons and daughters helping their parents in the cotton, fruit, and vegetable fields.

(2) Narrow Social Security coverage which keeps men in the labor force longer. In several of the professional and white collar positions in the South, the retirement age is 72 rather than 65.

Industries

The South must attract new industry. To date, the types of industries which have relocated have not employed large numbers of people at high salaries. Lonsdale, in his study of rural Southern counties, says:

> The bulk of the rural South's new plants in the past decade have been drawn from . . . textiles, apparel, food products, furniture, chemicals, and electrical machinery. As a general rule . . . these firms are characterized by a low payroll per employee, a low value added per production worker, and low capital expenditure per employee. In brief, they are usually labor-oriented, low-profit-margin operations

wherein lower labor costs are considered essential to maintain a competitive market position.[8]

Pointing out that heavily black rural counties have received little or no new industry during the 1960s, Lonsdale suggests that manufacturing firms are avoiding heavily black counties in the rural South for three basic reasons:

(1) Most of these firms are . . . low-profit types, thus locating . . . where the level of education is accordingly low, would require heavy training investments which might cancel out profits.

(2) Firms fear federal guidelines on fair employment practice, and are afraid a percentage employment mix and attendant costs might be forced upon them.

(3) There is a widespread conviction that black workers are "easier prey" for union organizers.[9]

In another study of the responses of executives representing 32 plants in rural North Carolina, South Carolina, and Georgia, Lonsdale found the executives felt the rural South was racially prejudiced, school systems were ineffectual, and small town politics was corrupt. Because of the rural South's image as a socially undesirable place to live plants are unwilling to relocate in this area.[10]

Public Sector Employment Needs in the South

It is more difficult to identify job needs in the public sector in the rural South than it is to identify job needs that could be met by private enterprise. There are two things which create barriers whenever public employment is mentioned in this section of the country:

1. There is a strong aversion to the federal government which dates back to the days of Reconstruction. As a person told me in Alabama, "When

---

[8]R. E. Lonsdale, "Deterrents to Industrial Location in the Rural South," Research Previews, XVI, (April 1, 1969), pp. 2-3.

[9]Ibid., p. 4.

[10]Ibid., p. 5.

it comes to having the control of the federal government involved and doing without, people in my section of the state would rather do without."

2. Most of the federal financing that has come to the South has been related to the Defense Department, and people in the South have been conditioned to think that way. For example, the entire community of Huntsville, Alabama has resulted from the Redstone Arsenal and the fact that it has become the home for the United States Army Missile Command. Columbus, Georgia is kept alive by the Army's Fort Benning, and Charleston, South Carolina, by the Navy. The reason most military installations are south of the Mason-Dixon Line is not because of the weather but because southern legislators have seen this as a way of bringing federal monies into the area without directly infringing on the local life of the area. Southern communities have also lived through defense spending cutbacks and the resulting economic fluctuations. They are, therefore, wary about trusting federal money inputs in any large-size projects.

The cotton industry,which has been the second largest income source in the area and which provided a back-up for federal dollars, is moving out of the Southeast and towards the Southwest. As the cotton fields of Arizona expand, companies find it more profitable to build new mills in the Southwest than to upgrade existing mills in the Southeast. The increasing popularity of synthetic fibers further decreases the demand for the cotton-based industry of the Southeast.

Ranching and dairy farming are moving to such states as Florida, Louisiana, and Georgia. These states had few dairy herds in the past but now are becoming cattle-raising states.

When one thinks of public employment in the rural South, one thinks of human services. In the process of creating direct human services, other

kinds of employment would also be provided, such as construction jobs, clerical and maintenance staffs, and related services. The following human services are needed:

(1) Public Health—clinics, treatment schools, etc.

(2) Education—public school programs of every type.

(3) Special Education—the percentage of retardation is higher in rural areas than in other sections of the country. All services are needed.

(4) Services to the Mentally Ill.

(5) Social Welfare Services.

Housing Needs

In practically every state in the South, the need for housing has been identified as the greatest need. Therefore, expansion of the public Housing Authorities would be helpful, providing these states with enough federal backing to implement the Burke Amendment without barring welfare and other low-income clients.

Natural Resource Development

While the South has started to capitalize on its natural resources, more parks and recreational projects could be developed if more federal funding were available. The South is a natural haven for hunting, fishing, and camping sites but there is a dearth of roadside parks and campsites due to a lack of funds.

Highway Needs

With the additional attraction of Disney World, four-lane highways must be developed. Presently road conditions in the South are far below the national average. In Georgia, with the exceptions of highway 75 going north and south and highway 20 going east and west partway across the state, the backroads

or state-maintained roads in Georgia are death traps. It is no wonder that the Southern states rank near the top in the nation's holiday and weekend accident rates. Again using Georgia as an example, it is the 16th largest state in terms of population but has the 10th highest automobile accident death rate. These accidents are often the result of poor road conditions and poor road policing. There are not enough state police to begin to patrol even the main trunk lines. In a state geographically twice the size of Michigan, Georgia does not have even one-third the number of Michigan's State Police force.

Location of Federal Departments

There is no reason why more federal computer centers and laboratories such as the Center for Disease Control in Atlanta could not be located in the Southeast. Such facilities could be located in rural areas, providing employment for rural people. Short range jobs also could be provided in construction and road building if more funds were available.

State Matching Funds

The problem that comes to the forefront then is the formula for matching state dollars in the South. Limited state budgets make it impossible to approach the programs of the richer northern states who, because they have more state monies, can get more federal dollars for road building, parks, recreational areas; correctional programs, social welfare, health, education, etc. If the needs of the nation are to be met, we are going to have to examine the cost of upgrading certain sections of the country irrespective of how much of the tab that section of the country can pay.

EMERGENCY EMPLOYMENT ACT—SOME BASIC POLICY QUESTIONS WITH SPECIAL REFERENCE TO AMERICAN INDIAN RESERVATIONS

Robert M. Hunter*

Caveat

Given the complexity of the relationships between the federal government, state government, and American Indian reservations, it is exceedingly difficult to prepare a short paper on the role of the Public Employment Program on Indian reservations unless I assume the reader has considerable knowledge of the historic jurisdictional problems. Furthermore, data collected by the Bureau of Indian Affairs on manpower needs, unemployment, underemployment, and so forth are not considered accurate. However, using the best statistics available, I am presuming that the error is constant over time and thus, like most other rural manpower statistics, may be used as an index of direction if not magnitude. Data are included mainly for Department of Labor Region VIII and are presumed to be representative of reservations elsewhere in the nation.

Background

The United States government's policy toward Indian reservations was enunciated by President Nixon in June, 1970.

> 'We must assure the Indian that he can assume control of his own life without being separated involuntarily from the tribal group,' he said. 'And we must make it clear that Indians can become independent of federal control without being cut off from federal concern and federal support.'
>
> Saying few federal programs for Indians are administered and controlled by members of the tribe, Mr. Nixon asked Congress to permit them to take over both control and operation from federal agencies. . .

---

*Robert M. Hunter is Associate Professor of Sociology, and Director of the Bureau of Sociological Research, University of Colorado.

008824

> This, he argued, would 'directly channel more money into Indian communities, since Indians themselves would be administering programs and drawing salaries which now often go to non-Indian administrators.'[1]

This policy statement automatically resolves a series of traditional questions regarding whether Indian reservations should be terminated and whether Indians should be prepared systematically and tenaciously for employment off the reservation. In short, it is up to tribal membership speaking through their tribal councils to define the kinds of manpower programs needed on reservations and the relationship they wish to have with the federal government.

The almost uniform position of the tribes can be understood by reading the following resolution passed at a manpower conference in Denver, July 27 and 28, 1970. (Italics mine)

> WHEREAS, Several Indian tribes from an eight-state area have met in Denver, Colorado, this July 27 and 28 at the invitation of the Oglala Sioux Tribal Council and the Department of Labor and
>
> WHEREAS, The purpose of this conference was to identify and discuss various programs available to Indians through the federal government; and to determine methods for their more effective implementation and
>
> WHEREAS, *Historically, the several states of this nation have attempted to impinge upon, lessen and destroy the federally protected jurisdiction of Indian tribes within their individual boundaries and*
>
> WHEREAS, *All Indian tribes have continually fought to protect their unique relationship with the federal government as their only means of preserving their independence from state control and*
>
> WHEREAS, It is the opinion of the members of the conference that *the direct federal funding concept,* as implemented by OEO and other agencies *has provided the greatest benefit* to, and has held out the greatest hope for all Indians in their struggle to achieve a position of social and economic well-being and

---

[1] Wall Street Journal, June, 1970.

WHEREAS, Recent policy decisions by the various departments of the federal government, particularly the Department of Labor, have abandoned the direct grant concept in favor of the block grant concept in which funds for Indian programs are given to the state and

WHEREAS, Such block grant funding places the states in a position of controlling the purse strings, thus forcing the Indian tribes to accept federally allocated funds on the terms of the individual states and

WHEREAS, This places the Indian in an undesirable position of dependency upon the individual states and

WHEREAS, This is contrary to the views expressed by President Nixon in his message to Congress on July 8, 1970, in which he reemphasized the desirability of a continued federal-Indian relationship, and strongly encouraged further self-determination by all Indian people.

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, That the assembled tribes respectfully request and strongly urge that the block concept of grants be immediately suspended and the federal agencies fund all Indian programs directly to the tribes with no state interference.[2]

While policies to implement the Administration's position through the Bureau of Indian Affairs are labile and occasionally halting, it is fair to say that at present the Bureau is responsive to the expressed desires of the tribes; this new responsiveness may be characterized by the Employment Assistance Division's recent policy changes. For many years, Employment Assistance provided funds for Indians to leave the reservation and receive training in major metropolitan areas. This program was known as the Indian Relocation Program. From most reports, the efforts must be characterized as less than completely successful in furnishing Indians opportunities to enter metropolitan America. Recent policy statements have indicated that Employment Assistance will now direct its attention to preparing tribal members for employment on the reservation rather than off.

---

[2]Resolution presented to regional officials by the tribal representative from Region VIII at an Indian Manpower Conference sponsored by the Oglala Sioux Tribe, Pine Ridge, South Dakota, in Denver on July 27 and 28, 1970.

While there are undoubtedly many tribal members who want to leave the reservation, the vast majority look upon the maintenance of reservation land and resources as a part of their birthright and wish to preserve that reservation as home base. If this is what the tribes want, it is incumbent upon the BIA and all other federal agencies who provide support to the reservation directly. This is the case whether funds are administered directly to provide support for reservation development and employment opportunities on the reservation, as requested in the resolution above, or indirectly through states (which is required by certain statutes, for example, LEAA funds under the Omnibus Crime Bill). It is in this context that the following remarks about the Public Employment Program are made.

Reservation Differences

Few reservations have geographic access to the full resources of a metropolitan area, such as the Gila River Tribe which abuts Scottsdale, Arizona. There are also few tribes which have recently discovered vast natural resources, as is the case with the coal deposits of the Crow and the Navaho and the copper deposits of the Papago. However, the majority of reservations, specifically those of the north central mountain plains area, lack both kinds of resources.

The major employer on the reservation is the federal government. Employment is through the Bureau of Indian Affairs or through tribal councils, usually under Buy-Indian contract. Although some tribes have incomes from natural resources—land leases, etc.—most funds for jobs which provide services on the reservation not currently under the BIA are for services originally offered by the Bureau and now contracted for under the Buy-Indian contract.

The Bureau has attempted to arrive at a number of nationwide policies for reservation development and self-determination. But a single policy

cannot be applied to all reservations because of diverse resources, needs, and population size. Thus, there is a recognized need for asymmetrical development policies. The north central mountain states tribes are well-suited for tourist development and industrial park-style development, both of which will require substantial subsidy through the year 2000. In the meantime, the implicit policy for manpower development on the reservation seems to be directed at preparing Indians to deliver services through Buy-Indian contract. And these contracts are currently being supplied by non-Indians.

Policy Consideration I

The PEP views public employment as transitional. Yet, Indian tribes, as most rural communities, do not have at the present and will not have in the foreseeable future, an adequate tax base to provide for permanent employment of PEP participants through tribal government. Thus, if the Public Employment Program is managed directly through the tribe with no coordination with the Bureau of Indian Affairs, respecting Bureau commitments to employ, these jobs will have to be subsidized into the indefinite future and will end when PEP funds cease.

Policy Consideration II

A second problem concerns the extent to which the Department of Labor should provide guidelines specifying the kinds of positions PEP monies can be used to support. Here the complexities begin. On many if not most reservations, tribal government is unstable. Essentially, a spoils system for the allocation of jobs is in effect. A product of this condition is a rapid turnover (approximately every two years) of persons in administrative positions. The BIA has experienced this turnover for many years and it is now being felt by other federal agencies which provide substantial amounts of

funds for reservation development (OEO, DOL, EDA, AND HUD). In this respect, the reservation government is similar to the federal government; however, the problem is increased since most tribal presidents hold two-year rather than four-year terms of office. There is a general recognition among tribal leadership that in order to conduct successfully their own affairs, competent administrators and planners must be employed and must be assured of reasonable tenure in office based on professional performance. Region VIII has been experimenting with tribal merit systems. It might be wise to require a merit system for PEP employees as a contingency for receipt of EEA funds.

Policy Consideration III

Statistical tables describing the PEP program using data from January, 1972 are included in this report.[3] During the two-month period under consideration, the termination rate was a modest 7 percent with an even more modest number moving into nonsubsidized positions. When the data were released for February, terminations had increased. The United Sioux Tribes of South Dakota serve as an example.

> It will be noted that the United Sioux Tribes of South Dakota had a total of 226 accumulative participants as of this date with a total of 60 terminations. These terminations amount to approximately 26 1/2 percent of the total. As we look at the reasons for termination, we find that 12 of the 60 were placed in the unsubsidized public employment and an additional 5 were placed in unsubsidized private employment. Only one was moved into another program and this involved enrollment in another manpower program. Nineteen of these dropped out of the program and an additional 23 were terminated for other reasons. Further investigation of these reasons for drop-out and for the "other" category indicated the following distribution. Eleven terminated because of alcohol problems; two because of transportation problems; one because of an accident in which he was involved; six were terminated because they were ineligible for the particular job position (some of these were reentered into the program in

[3]Dr. Hunter had included extensive tables in his original paper. Selected tables have been included in this report.

other job categories); four were attending the post-secondary institute; six had been terminated by the director as being incompetent in the particular job they were occupying; one was let go for insubordination; seven dropped out because of family problems. Five gave no reasons for dropping out and two moved away from the area. This indicates that alcohol problems and family problems were the two most frequent reasons for dropping out of the program.[4]

This may be considered a period of adjustment while the inter-tribal groups (which have contracted with the Department of Labor to administer this program) find modes of accommodation with the individual tribes to successfully fulfill the contract.

The review of the statistics on education level and hourly wages suggests problems the contractor has in selecting persons for PEP positions. In my view, the disparate percentages for the distribution of PEP positions in the programs by public service areas do not represent the differing needs of the reservations participating in the program. Rather they reflect the absence of a plan for the effective utilization of PEP positions to support any long-term tribal goals. Nearly every tribe has additional manpower programming--Operation Mainstream, New Careers, Public Service Careers, and MDTA from the Department of Labor, Tribal Work Experience and Employment Assistance from the BIA, and OEO programs. Not only is there an absence of coordination among these different programs, there is an absence of a general plan to help assist tribal leadership select positions supportive of tribal service needs and future reservation development. It might be wise to recommend that a portion of PEP positions be allotted to employ qualified and capable individuals so that manpower planning and coordination can be achieved. And given the educational levels and the needs of the tribes for Indian

---

[4]Robert Dimit, "The United Sioux Tribes of South Dakota and the Experience with the Public Employment Program." Paper presented to the Mountain States Regional Manpower Advisory Committee at Medora, North Dakota, May 11, 1972.

administrators, it also may be desirable to integrate PEP, Public Service Careers, and New Careers in such a way as to provide training and education for a major upgrading effort.

Policy Consideration IV

The major source of permanent employment on Indian reservations at the present time is the BIA. The Bureau is structured so that major policy-making through program implementation is carried out at the Area Office by the area directors and at the reservation level by superintendents. I have worked with New Careers programming for the past four years (which has involved some 250 new positions with the Bureau or under Buy-Indian contract with the tribes) and have found the individual superintendents and area directors have substantial power. Negotiations conducted in Washington leading to commitments for permanent employment do not automatically guarantee these positions. Instead multi-level negotiations with the tribes, the superintendents, the tribal groups, and the area office staff must be undertaken. In order to prevent deviation from agreed to goals, such negotiations must be continuous throughout the duration of the program.

When 150 positions were created in the Judicial Prevention and Enforcement Services branch, the commissioner stated that none of the positions should involve traditional law enforcement roles;instead he wanted to create positions in the rehabilitation and correctional arena. Yet through lack of understanding of their own agency's policy or through deliberate disregard of this policy, the special officers on the reservations have tried to make police officers of a number of New Careerists.

This condition is transitional. But it is apparent the Department of Labor is responsible for maintaining adherence to BIA policy, not the Bureau of Indian Affairs. This means manpower personnel responsible for program

monitoring and guidance also are responsible for a variety of other kinds of state programs. And due to high turnover, such personnel may not fully understand reservation problems.

A possible solution would be establishing Indian desks in each regional Manpower Administration office where there is a large Indian reservation population. These desks could provide continuity between the DOL, the Bureau at all levels, and the tribes. At the same time, policy guidelines designed for urban PEP should be relaxed to permit flexible coordination of Public Service Careers, PEP, and other manpower programming in rural areas. Inasmuch as reservation needs differ regionally, Indian desks should not develop symmetrical policies. But policy implementation with specific guidelines should be under the direction of the Regional Manpower Administrators.

Summary

Despite many complaints to the contrary, I believe Indian reservations have more resources available to them than any group in the country. Moreover, there is a great willingness on the part of federal agencies to develop and design programs in support of Indians' desire for self-determination.

In Philadelphia, Mississippi, on April 19 and 20, 1972, I heard that the Mississippi Band of Choctaws, with a population under 4,000, has current resources available from the BIA of $3 million per year and an annual grant amount from other federal agencies of $7 million--a total of $10 million. While some reservations have been left out, these kinds of funding levels per capita are not unusual. A special report on the financial condition of reservations published in 1968 showed that the available income on the Pine Ridge reservation (population approximately 12,000) was less than $1,600 per family, and that the total amount expended in federal funds amounted to $8,000 per family. While this kind of calculation misrepresents the actual

situation since it includes all social expenditures (these would seldom be included in municipality figures) it does suggest that simply pouring money into Indian reservations without comprehensive and coordinated planning and development will not substantially improve conditions. It seems that the ratio of BIA funds to other federal funds (three to seven) is fairly representative for most reservations. The American Indian has a variety of legitimate and real claims against the non-Indian, which explain the level of funding currently available. But the concept of Indian self-determination requires the full support of tribal leadership to develop the Indian's capability to manage his own affairs through comprehensive planning, integrated-coordinated programming, and efficient self-administration in accordance with the requests of the tribes.

It is most important to note that the tribes themselves are aware of the need for planning as witnessed by the following resolution: (Italics mine)

> WHEREAS, Several Indian tribes from an eight-state area have met in Denver, Colorado, this July 27 and 28 at the invitation of the Oglala Sioux Tribal Council and the Department of Labor and
>
> WHEREAS, The purpose of this conference was to identify and discuss various programs available to Indians through the federal government; and to determine methods for their more effective implementation and
>
> WHEREAS, Inter-tribal councils in the various states and areas have been organized for some time and have become a useful form for the tribes in exchanging information about programs and effective bodies in advocating Indian program interests and
>
> WHEREAS, National administrations have been trying to determine what Indians want and
>
> WHEREAS, President Nixon's recent message to Congress put his administration on record as favoring greater tribal self-determination and encouraging tribes to assume control over programs administered for the benefit of Indians and
>
> WHEREAS, *There is an absence of a systematic state or regional plan for reservation socioeconomic development which*

incorporates the needs and aspirations of Indian tribes in the several states which can be presented to state governments of the respective states and

WHEREAS, Experiences of the tribal governments indicate that it is extremely difficult if not impossible to obtain adequate representation on various state advisory and decision-making bodies responsible for allocation of federal funds within the several states and

WHEREAS, If tribes are to be effective in administering programs, they must have the resources of research and planning staff, that can provide them with the kind of staff assistance they need and

WHEREAS, Inter-tribal councils can play an important role in assisting tribes to develop plans and administer programs and

WHEREAS, Inter-tribal councils need staff to provide data gathering, analysis, planning continuity and communication about programs and program planning among tribes and between tribes and the various agencies and

WHEREAS, Inter-tribal councils may provide the vehicle for planning and administering various programs for the benefit of all the tribes and

WHEREAS, Inter-tribal councils can also become useful in administering programs for urban Indians within the states or area and thus bring greater unity between reservation Indians and other Indians within the states.

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, That the assembled tribes respectfully request and strongly urge that the Manpower Administration, Department of Labor, the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, the Office of Economic Opportunity, the Economic Development Administration, the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration, Department of Justice, the Department of Housing and Urban Development, and the Bureau of Indian Affairs collectively or separately multi-fund or individually fund an operating staff of Indian planners and administrators which will permit the Inter-Tribal Policy Advisory Boards of Montana, the United Sioux Tribes of South Dakota, and the United Sioux Tribes of North Dakota to establish state and regional comprehensive planning for the tribes in their respective states in the fields of (a) economic and community development, (b) comprehensive manpower planning and utilization, (c) comprehensive planning for law and order, (d) comprehensive planning for youth development and delinquency prevention.

FURTHER BE IT RESOLVED, That the several tribes in conference recognize the needs of tribes located in the states of Colorado, Utah, and Wyoming for planning staff to develop comprehensive plans in the same program areas in their respective states. *We therefore request that funds be made available to assist these tribes to participate in state planning, regional inter-tribal planning, and program development.*

FURTHER BE IT RESOLVED, That the Manpower Administrator, United States Department of Labor, Region VIII, is respectfully requested to seek funds to support a series of three two-day planning meetings in Denver, Colorado, to operationalize this resolution by inviting appropriate federal agency representatives to meet with the following tribal organizations: Inter-Tribal Policy Advisory Board of Montana, the United Sioux Tribes of South Dakota, the United Tribes of North Dakota, the Arapahoe and Shoshone Tribes of Wyoming, the Tribes of Utah, and the Tribes of Colorado. It is respectfully requested that said meetings be conducted at the earliest possible time with a view to establishing a firm plan for state and regional inter-tribal council planning operations by October 15, 1970.[5]

Federal agencies with programs on Indian reservations must supply funds so tribes can employ and train planners to execute the implementation of current Administration policies.

---

[5]Resolution presented to regional officials by the tribal representatives of Region VIII at an Indian Manpower Conference sponsored by the Oglala Sioux Tribe, Pine Ridge, South Dakota, in Denver on July 27 and 28, 1970.

Table 1

AMERICAN INDIAN POPULATION[a]

	Colorado	Montana	North Dakota	South Dakota	Utah	Wyoming	Region VIII	United States
Number of Reservations or Parts	2	7	4	9	6	1	26[b]	NA
Indian Population	1,764	22,592	13,948	29,707	5,999	4,140	78,150	452,290
% of Region VIII Indian Population	2.02	28.91	17.85	38.01	7.68	5.30	100.00	—
% of National Indian Population	.39	4.99	3.08	6.57	1.33	.92	17.28	100.00
% of Total Civilian Population	.086	3.28	2.31	4.55	.58	1.31	1.46	.23
Regional Rank 1 - 6 1 = Highest	6	2	3	1	4	5	—	—

[a]From: The Bureau of Indian Affairs, United States Department of Interior, "Report of Labor Force, 1970."

[b]This total reflects reservations which are in more than one state in Region VIII.

Table 2

PERCENT INDIAN UNEMPLOYMENT/STATE FOR REGION VIII[a]
AVAILABLE LABOR FORCE 16 YEARS OLD+

	Total	Male	Female
Colorado	46.2	40.1	54.4
Montana	43.4	42.2	45.6
Utah	45.4	49.7	40.2
Wyoming	45.6	42.8	50.0
North Dakota	65.5	69.7	60.1
South Dakota	43.8	51.5	30.7

[a]Bureau of Indian Affairs Statistics, March, 1970.

Table 3

UNEMPLOYMENT

	Colorado	Montana	North Dakota	South Dakota	Utah	Wyoming	Region VIII	United States
Total Civilian Work Force[a]	943,100	297,600	267,830	304,900	439,600	159,100	2,412,130	82,125,000
Percent Unemployed[a]	4.3	6.7	4.4	3.9	6.2	5.0	4.95	4.75[c]
Percent Indian Male Unemployment[b]	40.1	42.2	69.7	51.5	49.7	42.8	49.1	NA
Percent Indian Female Unemployment[b]	54.4	45.6	60.1	30.7	40.2	50.0	56.1	NA
Percent Total Indian Unemployment[b]	46.2	43.4	65.5	43.8	45.4	45.6	51.7	NA

[a]From: United States Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics, for June, 1970.

[b]From: United States Department of Interior, Bureau of Indian Affairs, "Report of Labor Force, March, 1970."

[c]Seasonally adjusted.

Table 4

DISTRIBUTION OF PUBLIC EMPLOYMENT PROGRAM POSITIONS
BY PUBLIC SERVICE AREA IN FEBRUARY, 1972

Program Agent	State of Colorado		Ute Indian Tribe		Inter-Tribal Policy Board, Montana		United Sioux Tribe, South Dakota	
	No.	Percent	No.	Percent	No.	Percent	No.	Percent
Law Enforcement	1	16.7	2	50.0	13	10.9	13	7.8
Education	1	16.7	0	—	11	9.2	5	3.0
Public Works and Transportation	0	—	2	50.0	19	16.0	45	27.1
Hospital Health	0	—	0	—	8	6.7	14	8.4
Environmental Quality	1	16.6	0	—	1	.8	1	.6
Fire Protection	0	—	0	—	0	—	0	—
Parks & Recreation	1	16.6	0	—	33	27.7	1	.6
Social Security	2	33.3	0	—	17	14.3	53	31.9
Other	0	—	0	—	17	14.3	34	20.5
TOTAL	6		4		119		166	

Table 5

PUBLIC EMPLOYMENT PROGRAM PARTICIPANT CHARACTERISTICS IN FEBRUARY, 1972

Program Agent	State of Colorado	Ute Indian Tribe	Inter-Tribal Policy Board, Montana	United Sioux Tribe, South Dakota
			Percentage	
SEX				
Male	71.4	80.0	76.7	71.2
Female	28.6	20.0	23.3	28.8
MILITARY SERVICE STATUS				
Special Veteran	0	0	2.0	4.9
Vietnam-era Veteran	0	20.0	10.9	12.4
Veteran	0	60.0	30.8	17.2
Non-Veteran	100	20.0	56.2	65.5
OCCUPATIONAL STATUS				
Disadvantaged	42.9	100.0	100.0	92.0
Previously Emp. by Agent	28.[illegible]	20.0	8.2	10.1
Public Assistant Recipient	0	0	19.2	1.3
Profession (other than teacher)	14.3	0	2.7	3.1
GOVERNMENTAL UNIT				
State	0	0	1.4	0
County	0	0	0	.9
City	0	0	4.8	.4
Tribal Council	100.0	100.0	74.7	94.7
Federal	0	0	15.7	1.3
Other	0	0	3.4	2.6
HOURLY EEA WAGE				
Under $2.00	0	0	10.3	42.5
$2.00 - $2.99	57.1	60.0	87.0	38.0
$3.00 - $3.99	42.9	40.0	2.0	11.9
$4.00 - $4.99	0	0	.7	7.0
$5.00 and over	0	0	0	.4
AGE				
18 and under	0	0	2.0	.9
19 - 21	0	0	10.3	11.1
22 - 44	85.7	60.0	69.9	73.0
45 - 54	0	40.0	15.7	8.8
55 - 64	14.3	0	1.4	5.7
65 and over	0	0	.7	.4

(continued)

Table 5 (continued)

Program Agent	State of Colorado	Ute Indian Tribe	Inter-Tribal Policy Board, Montana	United Sioux Tribe, South Dakota
			Percentage	
EDUCATION				
8th or under	14.3	20.0	15.7	16.8
9th - 11th	42.9	60.0	25.3	25.2
12th	42.9	0	45.9	41.2
13th - 15th	0	20.0	11.0	15.9
16th or more	0	0	2.8	.9
Handicapped	0	0	8.9	2.2

1961

EXPERIENCE OF THE EMERGENCY EMPLOYMENT ACT IN BALANCE-OF-STATE MICHIGAN: SOME IMPLICATIONS FOR REVENUE SHARING IN RURAL AREAS*

Collette H. Moser**

In the summer of 1971, Congress passed the Emergency Employment Act. Its goal was to combat existent and persistent unemployment rates of over 6 percent nationally using a public service employment program.

Governmental units designated to serve as program agents under the Act included: (1) cities with a population of 75,000 or more; (2) counties with a population of at least 75,000 exclusive of program agents (cities—population of 75,000+) within the county; and (3) all states. These governmental units were to receive E.E.A. funds directly from the federal government.

Areas with a population of less than 75,000 were designated as "Balance-of-State." The administration of their funds was determined by the state. In the case of Michigan, Governor Milliken did not initially withhold balance-of-state funds. Instead these counties were allocated dollar amount grants. County application for funds was to be based on positions requested by public service sub-agents (schools, hospitals, police departments, etc.) and approved by the county commissioners.

Based on 1970 census figures, 65 of Michigan's 83 counties were designated as Balance-of-State. The total population of these 65 counties was 1,731,011. The mean population for these counties was 26,227 (median 20,676). Number of inhabitants ranged from 2,264 in Keweenaw County in the northern tip of the Upper Peninsula to 68,892 in Eaton County in the south central area of Michigan.

---

*Data for this study were initially collected by Michael Dennis and Dr. Moser for the Rural Manpower Policy Research Consortium meeting, February 23, 1972, in East Lansing, Michigan. This paper was presented at the joint meeting of the American Agricultural Economics Association, the Canadian Agricultural Economics Association, and the Western Agricultural Economics Association, Edmonton, Alberta, Canada, August, 1973.

**Collette Moser is Assistant Professor of Agricultural Economics, Michigan State University, and Director of the Rural Manpower Policy Research Consortium.

These balance-of-state counties in Michigan were authorized grants totaling $7,902,600 under Section 5 of the Act.[1] County grants ranged from $14,100 (Presque Isle) to $482,500 (Shiawassee County). Under this section, funds were allocated according to the volume and severity of unemployment in each county. The largest grant, $482,500, went to Shiawassee County where 3,100 persons were unemployed. Presque Isle received the smallest grant of $14,100.

Although counties such as Oscoda had relatively small numbers of unemployed persons, unemployment *rates* in these counties were frequently extremely high. For example, the 350 unemployed persons in the Upper Peninsula's Keweenaw County amounted to over one-third of the labor force (37.8%). The median unemployment rate for the 65 counties was 11.4 percent.

After total grant allocation per county had been determined, individual sub-agents in each county requested various numbers of positions and determined each position's pay rate. They were limited, however, by a $12,000 maximum salary per position to be paid out of E.E.A. funds. If local units wanted higher paying positions, they had to use their own funds to make up the difference.

The number of E.E.A. positions authorized (under Section 5) for each balance-of-state county in Michigan ranged from 3 to 74. The median number of positions was 18 (mean 21). In all, 1,388 positions were authorized for these counties and 1,285 (93%) were reported as filled by January, 1972.

---

[1]Funds appropriated under Section 5 were apportioned to the states based on a two-part formula reflecting the volume and severity of unemployment within each state compared to the volume and severity of unemployment in the United States. The apportionment of funds to individual program agents within each state is based on the same two-part formula, taking into account the volume and severity of unemployment in each program agent area within the state. Section 6 of the Act, called Special Employment Assistance, involved the allocation of additional funds to areas which experienced unemployment over 6 percent for the three consecutive months of April, May, and June. These data for rural Michigan were also analyzed but were not presented here because the results were not appreciably different from those under Section 5.

Average salaries per county for these positions was the lowest in Keweenaw County ($4,478) and the highest in Chippewa County ($8,078)—both counties are in the Upper Peninsula. The median level of average county salary for these E.E.A. positions was $5,652 (mean $5,853).

For policy analysis, one of the most important aspects of E.E.A. implementation at the local level was the choice of occupations to be funded under the Act. The selections were usually made by the sub-agents with the approval of the county commissioners, although the local officials could designate occupational needs even if they had not been suggested by a sub-agent.

State officials were given the authority to reject county applications for particular positions. Data on positions requested and filled were coded with the six-digit Department of Labor codes and were kept in the state E.E.A. offices. There were 171 different Dictionary of Occupational Titles (D.O.T.) codes for the over 1,300 E.E.A. positions in rural counties.

The occupations most often requested were janitors (143 requests) and policemen (114), totaling 19 percent of all the positions requested. There were 72 D.O.T. classifications for which one position each was requested. These 72 separate classifications represented approximately 5 percent of the total. Table 2 in the Appendix lists these 171 D.O.T. classifications as a function of the frequency with which the position was requested.

The largest percentage of occupational requests (34.4%) were in the service category, primarily for janitors and policemen. Professional, technical, managerial, and related occupations contained 22.2 percent of the positions requested. Teachers, teacher aides, and administrative assistants were the occupations most frequently requested in this category.

Structural work and the clerical and sales category each accounted for about 14 percent of the positions requested. The remaining four categories—

farming and related processing, machine trades, bench work, and miscellaneous--each accounted for less than 10 percent of the requests.

Table 3 in the Appendix rearranges the three-digit occupational data in Table 2 into the major one-digit occupational categories discussed above so that a clustering of occupations may be seen.

Characteristics of E.E.A. Recipients

After E.E.A. occupational positions were approved by the local officials and county applications were reviewed by the state, search began for employees to fill the positions. Openings usually were listed with the local office of the Michigan Employment Security Commission (M.E.S.C.) and sometimes positions were posted in newspapers. If the county hired its own E.E.A. administrator (with E.E.A. funds), this person usually screened applicants. More frequently, local officials such as county clerks served as administrators. When this occurred, screening was done by the sub-agents and/or M.E.S.C. The state E.E.A. office had the authority to revoke the hiring of an applicant if the hiree violated some guideline such as the residence requirement. Cases of nepotism existed and were more difficult to handle.

In order to analyze the characteristics of the people hired to fill the above-mentioned jobs, a random sample of 5 percent (72) of the 1,300 participants was drawn. Information was compiled from the written application on file in the E.E.A. Task Force Headquarters in Lansing, Michigan. These data include program participants as of January, 1972.

Of the sample of 72, 57 (79%) were male and 15 (21%) female. The mean age of the sample group was 35 and the median age was 33. Of the 72 E.E.A. participants, 69 (96%) were white. There was one Black male and two American Indian males.

The mean and median education of the sample was 12 years. The range of education was from 6 years (1 American Indian) to 17 years (1 white male). Of those sampled, 74 percent of the E.E.A. employees in the rural counties indicated at least a 12th grade education. Table 4 in the Appendix gives the education distribution of the E.E.A. employees.

In order to be hired under this program one either must be unemployed or underemployed. One must be unemployed for at least one week and looking for work for the previous four weeks. In the case of underemployed persons, the criterion is that one be a part-time employee or that the total income of family members 16 years or older is below set poverty levels. In this sample, 64 (88%) were unemployed, while 8 males (6 white and 2 American Indian) were underemployed.

Length of unemployment in the sample ranged from 0 to 52 weeks. The participant with zero weeks unemployment should have been considered underemployed as his income was well below poverty level. The median length of unemployment was 9.5 weeks while the mean was 18 weeks. Average length of unemployment was greater for females (median 16 weeks; mean 23 weeks) than for males (9-week median; 16-week mean).

Of those nine persons (12.5%) unemployed for 52 weeks immediately preceding their employment, five were male and four were female. Of the five males, two were Vietnam-era veterans and one a non-Vietnam-era veteran. Table 5 in the Appendix gives the frequency distribution of length of unemployment for this sample.

Designation of veteran status was important because, according to the Act, approximately one-third of the positions authorized were to be filled by veterans, particularly Vietnam veterans. Of the sample population, 44 persons (61.1%) were veterans. Of these veterans, 1 was female and 43 were

males. This means that the total male population of 57 (75%) were veterans.

Another concern of the Act was to employ as many disadvantaged persons as possible though no percentage was established. Of the total population of 75, 25 persons (35%) were registered as disadvantaged. Twenty-two of the 25 disadvantaged were males.

The average previous year's income of males was about twice that of females. For males, the mean previous year's income was $3,220 ($2,708 median). For females, the mean was $1,730.33 ($1,700 median). The one Black in the sample had a $1,600 income in the former year. One of the American Indians had an income of $726 and the other had an income of $4,000 in the previous year.

Another target under the E.E.A. guidelines was hiring the physically handicapped. In this sample, only 3 persons (4.2%) were handicapped.

Since one of the purposes of the Act was to create new jobs, agents were not to dismiss current employees and then rehire them. However, in the sample population of 72, there were 8 males and 0 females who had been employed by the agent at a previous time. The eight males represented 11 percent of the total population.

Interviews With E.E.A. Administrators

An additional part of this study was an attempt to evaluate attitudes, planning methods, and problems associated with the enforcement of the Emergency Employment Act in rural Michigan counties. A rough questionnaire was drafted. Questions were asked in discussion form to Upper Peninsula county administrators and officials in six other rural counties. Interviewees included individuals specifically employed to administer the E.E.A. program (if they existed in a particular county), county clerks, county commissioners, planners, county

extension agents, and others who had been involved in planning E.E.A. administration.

Interviewing was conducted by personal visits and telephone conversations. Since neither the questionnaire nor the responses was formalized, the following analysis is impressionistic based on conversation notes.

In general, the respondents were pleased with the Emergency Employment Act. The major complaint was that agents and sub-agents were given only a few weeks notice. Thus there was little time for planning. In fact, because of the short notice, few, if any, of the counties used formal planning boards. But most respondents did not feel additional planning capability was necessary. However, several suggested their rural counties lacked planning expertise and that help in this area would be welcomed if a longer time-frame were involved. Most agreed more help was needed in making allocative decisions than in making application for the grant money.

No formal assessment of community needs took place. In most cases, county commissioners took at face value the requests of the sub-agents. Where monetary requests exceeded the expected amount of the grant, funds usually were distributed to the sub-agents (i.e., schools, hospitals, etc.) in what seemed to the commissioners to be an equitable monetary amount. In some cases, this simply meant cutting in half everyone's monetary requests.

Sometimes conflicts arose between sub-agents and county officials over the specific use of funds. An interesting aspect of these conflicts was they occasionally dealt with using funds for emerging occupations or jobs which would necessarily involve services to the disadvantaged. For instance, in one county, the commissioners approved a 4-H position, but would not approve a position for an expanded nutrition aide. The expanded nutrition program used disadvantaged women to work with welfare recipient families.

The respondents noted requests usually were not for new jobs but rather were for an increased number of positions in existing job categories. Most, however, indicated that if they had it to do over again, the same occupations would probably be chosen. One commissioner felt they had probably gotten carried away in the "[illegible]dial area." In the future, he would like to see a few less janitors.

The respondents felt that the jobs did fill a community need, even though most agreed that the program hadn't made much of a dent in the unemployment rate. The same was true nationally since the E.E.A. was passed at a time when the national unemployment rate was over 6 percent. Its one billion dollar outlay could have been expected to create about 140,000 jobs, thus at best allowing the national unemployment rate to fall by 0.2 percentage points.[2]

The single largest criticism of the program was its temporary nature. Respondents worried about what would happen to the people and the positions at the end of E.E.A.'s two-year congressional funding period. This uneasiness about the future may help to explain their cautious attitude in making decisions on new job types.

Using unemployment figures to determine fund allocation was also criticized. Several respondents felt these figures did not represent adequately the degree of unemployment, underemployment, and need in their communities.[3]

---

[2]Sar Levitan and Robert Taggart, "The Emergency Employment Act: An Interim Assessment," Monthly Labor Review, Vol. 95, No. 6 (June, 1972), p. 3.

[3]For a more detailed analysis of this issue, see the papers and discussions presented in Labor Market Information in Rural Areas: Proceedings of a Conference (East Lansing, Michigan: Center for Rural Manpower and Public Affairs, Michigan State University, February 22-23, 1972).

Analysis of the Findings

Analysis of this study's findings may be divided into three parts: (1) findings with respect to the people and the occupations employed; (2) findings with respect to the planning mechanism; and (3) implications for rural areas of (1) and (2) for purposes of decentralized non-categorical and semi-non-categorical grants programs such as general revenue sharing, manpower revenue sharing, and the Rural Development Act of 1972.

First, with respect to the occupations employed, the findings indicate there was a two-pronged policy of choosing occupations which were already being utilized and ones which tended to be in low-risk, non-controversial areas whose products were easily understood and socially acceptable. Janitors and policemen alone accounted for almost 20 percent of the requests. The numbers and types of laborers requested were so numerous that there are problems of definition and aggregation. Using the data in Table 3 in the Appendix, it was determined that there were about 156 various laborers, 220 varieties of janitors, and 168 variants of policemen. These 544 workers accounted for about 40 percent of the requests.

A relatively small number of jobs were in the human resource development area, jobs which would help expand directly an area's human capital supply. Local areas rarely considered creating human resource development jobs in emerging occupations, such as vocational guidance counselors. Yet such jobs could have been procured within the $10,000 upper limit.

Most positions were in relatively low level occupations. This is particularly surprising since the wage rate paid was high for rural areas, and those selected for employment were quite qualified. In fact, public employers tended to cream the crop of the rural unemployed.

Over 75 percent of those employed had a high school education or above. Yet rural residents have lower average educational levels than their urban counterparts. According to the 1970 census, 36.7 percent of Michigan's rural residents had less than a 12th grade education, compared with 32.6 percent for urban residents. In this rural E.E.A. sample, less than 25 percent had not completed 12th grade.

In general, the hiring patterns under the E.E.A. in rural Michigan tended to indicate a pattern of creaming the ranks of the unemployed. This process is consistent with labor market segmentation theories which a number of labor economists currently are examining.[4] Labor market segmentation holds there are significant barriers to the assimilation of so-called "out" groups into the employment structure. These barriers may be a combination of labor market institutions and individual behavioral characteristics, such as employers' tastes or preferences for or against certain groups.

The emphasis on white prime-age males' employment in proportions greater than their representation in rural Michigan's work force may be a function of this segmentation.[5] In this sample, more men than women were hired (79% to 21%). There are several reasons for this situation. In part, it may be due to the program's emphasis on the employment of veterans; one-third Vietnam-era veterans was the goal. But this male bias also may be due to the nature

---

[4]See, for instance, papers in the December, 1972 meeting of the Industrial Relations Research Association, and the papers at the Harvard Conference on Labor Market Segmentation, March 16, 1973. Similar theories were also presented at the summer, 1972 meetings of the Union for Radical Political Economics but published papers were not presented.

[5]A study by David Stevens, "Labor Market Segmentation Theory and Non-Metropolitan Employment: The Missouri Balance-of-State Experience with the Emergency Employment Act of 1971," (paper presented at the Regional Science Association meetings, Stillwater, Oklahoma, April 13, 1973), presents findings on this issue which are similar to those found in this Michigan study.

of the jobs requested, which in sex-segregated labor markets may be called men's jobs. It is difficult to say which came first, the job or the idea of a "man's job."

As for the planning mechanism in rural Michigan the statistical data and the interviews indicate expediency was the main goal. But many respondents felt hirings would have been the same even if more time were allotted. Therefore, rural areas need greater planning capabilities. Rural areas need assistance discovering total community needs, assessing different methods for decision-making and fund allocation, determining which jobs are going to give the greatest long-run and short-run payoffs, and deciding whether the employment policy is one which maximizes the potential of the individual and reduces the tendency toward turnover of overly-qualified workers.

It is well-known that investment in human capital such as expenditures for health, education, and manpower programs has been lower in rural than in urban areas. It has been suggested that a special public employment program for rural areas be devised to meet these human resource needs.[6] The E.E.A., with its mandate for filling needed public services, could have provided staff financing for such a developmental program.

The Public Employment Program may not survive, but its administration provides some clues as to what may happen in other non-categorical, decentralized programs expected under the New Federalism. Although general revenue sharing is in its infantile stages, preliminary findings indicate trends which I believe are similar to the E.E.A. experience in rural Michigan. A report by N. Thomas Martin of the Center for Rural Manpower and Public Affairs

---

[6] See Dale Hathaway and Collette Moser, remarks before the Department of Labor Task Force on Public Sector Employment (Chicago, May 13, 1972); and "A Public Employment Program for Rural Areas" (paper presented at the National Manpower Advisory Board, September, 1972).

at Michigan State University indicates a preference by local officials for capital expenditures, for "bricks and asphalt." "New courthouses, fire trucks, and black-topped roads headed a list of priorities identified by local officials."[7]

Another study, "The Preliminary Survey of General Revenue Sharing Recipient Governments," provides further documentation of the tastes of governmental units for capital expenditures. The survey was conducted in 50 states, the District of Columbia, 19 Planned Variation Cities, and 715 units of local government of representative levels and sizes, and was prepared for the Office of Revenue Sharing, Washington, D.C. Released June 19, 1973, it states:

> Capital projects and other nonrecurring expenditures were the most frequently mentioned uses of revenue sharing funds. Many respondents cited uncertainty regarding the long-term continuity of the revenue sharing program as having been a factor in their choice of capital projects.[8]

Such priorities for sturdy reliable items such as buildings are similar to the requests for janitors and policemen. They represent a risk-aversion rather than a risk-preference function in the allocation of revenue sharing types of funds. The indefiniteness of the duration of the revenue sharing and the New Federalism once again may be an explanatory variable.

The Rural Development Act of 1972 contains revenue sharing elements. Although it was based on more than the New Federalism, it too emphasizes improvement of the physical rather than the human capital aspects of rural areas.[9]

---

[7]R. Thomas Martin, "Federal Revenue Sharing Priorities in Michigan," East Lansing, Michigan: Center for Rural Manpower and Public Affairs, Michigan State University, January, 1973. (Mimeographed)

[8]Office of Revenue Sharing, "Preliminary Survey of General Revenue Sharing Recipient Governments - Summary of the Report" (Washington, D.C.: Department of the Treasury, June 19, 1973), p. I.2.

[9]For a further discussion of the manpower aspects or lack, thereof, of this Act, see the papers in Manpower Planning for Jobs in Rural America: Proceedings of a Conference (East Lansing, Michigan: Center for Rural Manpower and Public Affairs, Michigan State University, December 1[illegible]-15, 1972).

The lack of local planning which took place under the E.E.A. in rural Michigan does not bode well for the proposed Manpower Revenue Sharing which will require such decision-making on a much larger and more frequent basis. Presumably Ancillary Manpower Planning Boards (AMPBs) will take up some of the slack, but there still will be the need to increase local expertise in this area.

The decisions made for rural areas under E.E.A., the Rural Development Act, and Revenue Sharing may represent the values of the community and may, in fact, represent a fulfillment of their needs. However, unless rural administrators and residents are apprised of the alternatives and unless the outcomes of their decisions are carefully evaluated, even increased allocations to rural areas will fail in their attempts to bring greater human services program parity between rural and urban areas.

Table 1 -- Labor Force, Number Unemployed and Unemployment Rate--By Size of Title 5 "Balance-of-State" Counties

County	Population Ranking	Labor Force	No. Unemployed	Unemployment Rate
Eaton	68,892	30,000	900	3.0
Allegan	66,575	15,858	2,125	13.4
Marquette	64,686	12,716	1,475	6.8
Midland	63,769	25,714	1,800	7.0
Shiawassee	63,075	21,233	3,100	14.6
Livingston	58,967	13,554	1,125	8.3
Van Buren	56,173	17,437	2,075	11.9
Lapeer	52,317	19,444	700	3.6
Tuscola	48,603	12,716	1,475	11.6
Clinton	48,492	21,951	900	4.1
St. Joseph	47,392	20,175	1,150	5.7
Ionia	45,848	14,955	1,675	11.2
Isabella	44,594	13,596	775	5.7
Cass	43,312	10,261	1,375	13.4
Montcalm	39,660	13,816	1,575	11.4
Gratiot	39,246	13,806	1,850	13.4
Grand Traverse	39,175	15,741	1,700	10.8
Barry	38,166	15,000	900	6.0
Branch	37,906	12,838	950	7.4
Hillsdale	37,171	6,571	1,025	9.1
Delta	35,924	13,208	1,400	10.6
Sanilac	34,889	12,308	1,600	13.0
Houghton	34,652	9,859	700	7.1
Huron	34,083	13,393	1,500	11.2
Chippewa	32,412	9,843	1,250	12.7
Alpena	30,708	10,833	1,300	12.0
Newaygo	27,992	7,500	825	11.0
Mecosta	27,992	9,063	750	8.3
Iosco	24,905	5,859	375	6.4
Menominee	24,587	8,333	600	7.2
Dickinson	23,753	9,062	725	8.0
Mason	22,612	7,971	550	6.9
Gogebic	20,676	6,140	700	11.4
Manistee	20,094	7,839	925	11.8
Wexford	19,717	7,868	1,550	19.7
Emmet	18,331	7,170	875	12.2
Oceana	17,984	4,438	750	16.9
Clare	16,695	5,023	1,100	21.9
Cheboygan	16,573	6,571	1,025	15.6
Charlevoix	16,541	6,092	725	11.9
Osceola	14,838	1,042	150	12.8
Iron	13,813	3,750	675	18.0
Gladwin	13,471	3,082	450	14.6
Presque Isle	12,836	4,255	200	4.7
Antrim	12,612	4,094	475	11.6
Ogemaw	11,903	3,774	1,000	26.5
Arenac	11,149	2,734	175	6.4

Table 1 (continued)

County	Population Ranking	Labor Force	No. Unemployed	Unemployment Rate
Leelanau	10,872	4,615	600	13.0
Ontonagon	10,548	5,500	275	5.0
Otsego	10,422	3,810	400	10.5
Roscommon	9,892	3,070	175	5.7
Mackinac	9,660	3,277	675	20.6
Benzie	8,593	3,185	500	15.7
Alger	8,568	2,642	325	12.3
Schoolcraft	8,226	2,564	200	7.8
Baraga	7,789	2,500	275	11.0
Missaukee	7,126	2,358	250	10.6
Alcona	7,113	1,681	200	11.9
Luce	6,789	2,407	325	13.5
Crawford	6,482	2,247	200	8.9
Lake	5,661	1,980	200	10.1
Kalkaska	5,272	2,098	300	14.3
Montmorency	5,247	2,083	250	12.0
Oscoda	4,726	6,055	775	14.4
Keweenaw	2,264	926	350	37.8
	1,731,011	571,486	57,275	

Median - 20,676

Mean - 26,227

Median Unemployment Rate - 11.4%

"Balance-of-State" Unemployment Rate (Total) - 10.04%

Median No. of Unemployed - 750

Mean Unemployment Rate - 11.27%

Table 2 — Dictionary of Occupational Titles Ranked by Number of Positions Requested Under Title 5 by "Balance-of-State" Counties

Ranking	No. of Positions	D.O.T. No.	Position Description
1	143	382.884	Janitor, M.M., Custodian, et. al.
2	114	376.868	Deputy Sheriff, Patrolman, Trooper, et. al.
3	52	850.887	Laborer
4	51	407.884	Grounds Keeper
5	48	955.887	Public Works Laborer
6	43	195.108	Social Worker, Youth Agent, Juvenile Off., et. al.
7	42	201.368	Secretary
8	41	899.381	Maintenance Man, Caretaker, P.W.M.M.
9	39	092.228	Teachers, Teacher Aide
10	37	899.884	Bus Driver, Mechanic, M.M.
11	34	203.588	Clerk-Typist, Stenographer, Typist
12	30	355.878	Nurses Aide, Orderly, Hospital Attendant
13	27	099.368	College Recruiting Aide, Teacher Aide, Lunchroon Super.
14	26	206.388	Clerks
15	24	304.884	Laborer
15	24	955.885	Disposal Plant Operator, Sewer Service
17	20	341.368	Recreation Facility Attendant, Recreation Personnel, LPN
17	20	375.268	Deputy Sheriff, Narcotics Investigator, Patrolman
19	18	169.168	Admin. Assistant, Trainees
19	18	377.868	Deputy Sheriff
21	17	095.108	Counselor
22	16	188.188	Assessor, Assistant Assessor, Equalization Asst.
22	16	929.887	Laborer, Sanitation Assistant
24	15	869.884	Laborer
25	14	209.388	Clerks-specialized
25	14	862.381	Plumber, M.M.
27	13	091.228	Teacher
27	13	210.388	Bookkeeper, Clerks
27	13	219.388	Dispatcher, Clerks
29	12	249.368	Assistant Librarian, Library Clerk
29	12	304.887	Yardman, Grounds Keeper, Laborer
32	10	375.168	Sheriff Deputy
32	10	075.128	Registered Nurse
32	10	383.884	M.M., Janitor
35	8	005.081	Sanitarian, Engineer Trainee
35	8	005.281	Draftsman
35	8	100.168	Librarian
35	8	620.281	Bus Driver, Mechanics
34	7	075.378	Nurse
39	7	195.168	Nutrition Aide, Rec. Director, Community Organizer
39	7	202.388	Stenographer, Secretary-Steno., Receptionist
39	7	318.887	Kitchen Aide
39	7	355.078	Nurse, Orderly, Outreach Worker
39	7	359.878	Teachers' Aide
45	6	168.168	Zoning Administrator, Assistant Assessor
45	6	404.884	Tree Trimmer
47	5	168.287	Bldg. Inspector, Sanitation Inspector
47	5	407.887	Grounds Keeper, Recreational Worker
47	5	589.887	Maintenance Workers

Table 2 (continued)

Ranking	No. of Positions	D.O.T. No.	Position Description
47	5	638.884	General Maintenance
47	5	899.887	Community Custodian
47	5	905.883	Truck Driver
47	5	906.883	Truck Driver
47	5	913.883	Emergency Ambulance Driver
47	5	955.000	Road Repair, Water Service
47	5	233.138	Median Technician
57	4	096.128	Homemaker, Extension Agent Assistant
57	4	166.168	City Manager, EEA Program Coordinator
57	4	187.118	Program Director
57	4	237.168	Clerk, Civilian Dispatcher
57	4	321.138	Housekeeper, Hospital Housekeeper
57	4	331.703	Teacher Aide
57	4	379.368	Radio Dispatcher
57	4	424.883	Equipment Operator
57	4	860.887	Carpenter
66	3	223.338	Kitchen Employee
66	3	017.281	Assistant Draftsman, Engineering Aide
66	3	020.188	City Rec. Administrator, Program Assistant
66	3	029.381	Laboratory Assistant
66	3	040.081	Forester
66	3	166.228	Homemaker Aide
66	3	197.287	Assistant Appraiser
66	3	239.588	Meter Reader, Water Serviceman
66	3	372.868	Turn Key Officer, Meter Attendant
66	3	381.887	Janitress, Laborer
66	3	529.887	Cook's Assistant
77	2	079.378	Dental Assistant, LPN
77	2	099.168	Audio Visual Specialist
77	2	166.268	Outreach Interviewer
77	2	169.268	Secretary
77	2	187.168	Maintenance Man
77	2	199.168	Urban Planner, Planner-Implementer
77	2	199.288	Traffic Technician
77	2	201.308	Secretary
77	2	219.338	Zoning Clerk, Assessing Clerk
77	2	306.878	Homemaker, Day Matron
77	2	323.887	Homemaker Aide
77	2	354.878	Health Dept. Assistant
77	2	360.281	Carpenter Repairman
77	2	361.887	Laundry Worker
77	2	373.884	Fireman
77	2	376.808	Patrolman
77	2	379.878	Dog Catcher
77	2	389.381	Maintenance
77	2	407.181	Sanitary Landfill Attendant
77	2	609.884	General Laborer
77	2	850.883	Sanitary Landfill
77	2	869.887	Sanitary Maintenance Attendant
77	2	913.463	Bus Driver, Custodian

Table 2 (continued)

Ranking	No. of Positions	D.O.T. No.	Position Description
100	1	010.081	Maintenance Supervisor
100	1	018.587	Surveyor's Aide
100	1	019.187	Drainage Design Coordinator
100	1	041.081	Biologist
100	1	055.081	Sanitary Engineer
100	1	078.368	Dental Hygienist
100	1	079.118	Sanitarian
100	1	079.853	4-H Home Economist Assistant
100	1	092.278	Teacher's Aide
100	1	099.228	Vocational Education Implementer
100	1	149.028	Elementary Teacher
100	1	160.188	Accountant
100	1	162.118	County Program Administering Agent
100	1	166.008	Employment Counselor
100	1	099.208	Visiting Teacher
100	1	375.138	Police Clerk
100	1	378.879	Dog Warden
100	1	382.138	Maintenance Superintendent
100	1	406.884	County Park Laborer
100	1	407.134	Park Maintenance Supervisor
100	1	407.868	Maintenance Man
100	1	409.484	Tree Trimmer
100	1	455.885	Sanitary Fill Dump Operator
100	1	610.000	Night Custodian
100	1	633.281	Office Machine Repairman
100	1	740.887	Painter
100	1	806.887	Equipment Repairman
100	1	829.381	Equipment Operator
100	1	829.887	Electrician's Helper
100	1	844.884	Cement Mason
100	1	859.883	P.W. Equipment Operator
100	1	860.128	Instructional Maintenance
100	1	860.137	Carpenter, Labor Foreman
100	1	860.281	Carpenter
100	1	861.381	Brick and Stone Mason
100	1	869.381	House Builder
100	1	892.228	Teacher Aide
100	1	896.884	Building Trade and Maintenance
100	1	899.133	Crew Leader
100	1	899.137	Airport Manager
100	1	912.384	Airport Maintenance Man
100	1	950.782	Sanitary Engineer
100	1	955.884	Maintenance Man
100	1	969.387	Custodian Supervisor Recreational Bldg.
100	1	979.381	Copy Camera Man-Apprentice
100	1	166.088	Vocation Counselor
100	1	166.118	Ambulance Service Director
100	1	168.368	Youth Officer Assistant
100	1	168.378	Experimental Health Aide
100	1	182.168	Construction Supervisor

Table 2 (continued)

Ranking	No. of Positions	D.O.T. No.	Position Description
100	1	184.118	Assistant Airport Supervisor
100	1	187.188	Recreation Director
100	1	188.118	Public Works Director
100	1	192.228	Teacher
100	1	195.208	Court Investigator
100	1	203.388	Stenographer
100	1	203.583	Clerk-Typist
100	1	209.588	Clerk-Typist
100	1	209.688	Data Reporter
100	1	219.488	Deputy City Clerk
100	1	221.[illegible]38	Materials Coordinator
100	1	236.382	Telefacts Clerk
100	1	249.268	Clerical Survey Worker
100	1	282.884	Aide Custodian
100	1	299.468	Cashier
100	1	311.878	Cafeteria Employee
100	1	315.381	Matron and Cook
100	1	355.087	Nurse Health Aide
100	1	369.877	Social Services Aide
100	1	371.783	Bridge Attendant
100	1	373.868	Correctional Officer
100	1	375.868	Corrections Officer

Table 3 — Distribution of Positions Requested Under Title 5 in "Balance-of-State" Counties by Occupational Category

D.O.T. No.	Public Service Number	Total No. Requested	Position Titles
0 - 1.9 — Professional, Technical, and Managerial Occupations — Total = 301			
005.081	4	5	Engineer Trainee, Sanitation Assistant
	5	3	Sanitarian
005.281	3	5	Draftsman, Engineer Aide and Rodman
	9	3	Draftsman
010.081	8	1	Maintenance Supervisor
017.281	3	3	Assistant Draftsman, Engineering Aide
018.587	3	1	Surveyor's Aide
019.187	9	1	Drainage Design Coordinator
020.188	1	1	City Recreation Administrator
	5	1	Sanitary Landfill Operator
	9	1	Program Assistant
029.381	2	1	Laboratory Assistant
	4	2	Laboratory Assistant
040.081	5	2	Foresters
	7	1	Forester
041.081	5	1	Biologist
045.108	2	15	Education Counselor, Youth Counselor, Counselor, Guidance Counselor
	4	1	Auxiliary Worker - Comm. of Mental Health
	8	1	Veterans Counselor
055.081	3	1	Sanitary Engineer
075.128	2	2	Registered Nurse
	4	8	Registered Nurse, Staff Nurse
075.378	2	4	Nurse, Registered Nurse
	4	3	Registered Nurse, Prof. Nurse I, Public Health Nurse II
078.368	4	1	Dental Hygienist
079.118	4	1	Sanitarian
079.378	4	2	Dental Assistant, LPN Nurse
079.853	8	1	4-H Home Economist Assistant
091.228	2	13	Teacher (Graphic Arts, English), Teacher Aide, Reading Consultant
092.228	2	39	Elementary Teacher, Coordinator Student Services, Teacher Aide, Elementary Music Teacher, Program Assistant, Special Ed. Teacher
092.278	2	1	Teacher's Aide (Elem.)
096.128	8	3	Homemaker, Homemaker Consultant
	9	1	Extension Agent Assistant
099.168	2	2	Audiovisual Specialist
099.208	2	1	Visiting Teacher
099.228	2	1	Vocational Ed. Implementer
099.368	2	27	College Recruiting Aide, Lunchroom Supervisor, Teacher's Aide
100.168	2	5	Elementary Librarian, Asst. Librarian
	9	3	Librarian
149.028	2	1	Elementary Teacher
160.188	9	1	Accountant

Table 3 (continued)

D.O.T. No.	Public Service Number	Total No. Requested	Position Titles
162.118	9	1	County Program Administering Agent
166.008	8	1	Employment Counselor
166.088	8	1	Vocation Counselor
166.118	4	1	Ambulance Service Director
166.168	7	1	Benefits and Service Records Supervisors
	9	3	City Manager, EEA Program Coordinator
166.228	8	3	Homemaker Aide
166.268	8	2	Outreach Interviewer
168.168	3	2	Zoning Administrator, Bldg. Inspector
	9	4	Assistant Assessor
168.287	3	1	Building Inspector
	5	2	Sanitation Aide, Sanitation Inspector
	4	1	Sanitation Inspector
	9	1	Zoning Assistant
168.368	2	1	Youth Officer Assistant
168.378	5	1	Experimental Health Aide
169.168	2	2	Misc. Administrators
	3	1	Project's Assistant
	4	1	Administrative Assistant
	8	1	Tax Office Trainee
	9	13	Equalization Fieldman, Admin. Asst. Supervisory Personnel
169.268	2	2	Secretary
182.168	3	1	Construction Supervisor
184.118	3	1	Assistant Supervisor of Airport
187.118	8	4	Program Director
187.168	7	2	Maintenance Man
187.188	7	1	Recreation Director
188.118	5	1	Public Works Director
188.188	3	1	Assistant Assessor
	9	15	Asst. Assessor, Fieldman, Equalization Asst., Deputy Assessor, Tax Assessor, Assessor, Fieldman-Appraiser
192.228	2	1	Teacher
195.108	1	9	Juvenile Probation Officer, Probation Officer, Juvenile Officer, Social Worker
	2	15	Youth Coordinator, Teacher Aide, Youth Agent, Youth Super., Family Housing Aide
	3	1	Youth Supervisor
	8	12	Youth Worker, Employment Specialist, Social Worker, Youth Supervisor
	9	5	Social Worker, Juvenile Court Asst., Youth Advisor
	7	1	4-H Program Agent
195.168	2	6	Nutrition Aide, Recreation Director, Cook's Asst., Community Service Intern
	9	1	Community Organizer
195.208	1	1	Court Investigator
197.287	9	3	Assistant Appraiser
199.168	5	1	Urban Planner
	9	1	Planner - Implementer for City & County
199.288	3	2	Traffic Technician

Table 3 (continued)

D.O.T. No.	Public Service Number	Total No. Requested	Position Titles
2.0 - 2.9 — Clerical and Sales Occupations — Total = 190			
201.308	2	2	Secretary
201.368	1	1	Principal Sec.
	2	18	Secretary, General Office Sec., Bookkeeper, Office Clerk
	3	5	Secretary
	4	1	Secretary
	5	1	Secretary, Youth Worker
	8	1	Secretary
	9	15	Sec., Legal Sec., Med. Sec., Asst. Sec.
202.388	1	2	Stenographer
	2	1	Secretary-Receptionist
	3	2	Secretary-Stenographer, Stenographer
	4	1	Clerk-Stenographer (Health Dept.)
	9	1	
203.388	4	1	Stenographer
203.583	2	1	Clerk-Typist
203.588	1	2	Clerk-Typist, Typist
	2	8	Secretary, Typist, Clerk-Typist
	3	1	Stenographer
	4	3	Clerk-Typist, Secretary-Clerk
	7	1	Typist
	8	1	Typist
	9	18	Clerk-Typist, Court Clerk, Typist (pool), Court Typist
206.388	2	3	Clerk, Records Clerk
	3	5	Office Clerk, File Clerk
	4	2	Clerk
	9	16	Clerk, Asst. Zoning Administrator, General Office Clerk
209.388	1	2	Police Clerk-Typist, Clerk-Typist, File Clerk
	2	2	School Building Aide, Clerk-Typist
	3	2	Treasurer Office Clerk-Typist, Clerk-Typist
	8	4	Clerk-Typist, Typist Clerk
	9	4	Clerk-Typist
209.588	3	1	Clerk-Typist
209.688	3	1	Data Reporter
210.388	2	2	Bookkeeper
	3	1	Bookkeeper
	8	4	Clerk, Secretary-Bookkeeper
	9	6	Audit Clerk, Account Clerk, EEA Administrator
219.338	3	2	Zoning Clerk, Assessing Clerk
219.388	1	4	Police Clerk, Dispatcher
	2	5	General Office Clerk, Curriculum Office Clerk, Clerk-Secretary
	3	2	Field Inventory Clerk
	4	2	Admin. Clerk
	8	1	Clerk
	9	2	Clerk

Table 3 (continued)

D.O.T. No.	Public Service Matter	Total No. Requested	Position Titles
219.488	3	1	Deputy City Clerk
221.168	9	1	Materials Coordinator
223.338	2	3	Kitchen Employee
233.138	2	5	Medical Technician
236.382	1	1	Telefacts Clerk
237.168	1	1	Civilian Dispatcher
	4	1	Clerk
	9	2	Clerk
239.588	3	3	Meter Reader, Water Serviceman
249.268	9	1	Clerical Survey Worker
249.368	2	11	Asst. Librarian, Library Clerk, Library Aide
	9	1	Library Clerk
282.884	2	1	Aide Custodian
299.468	2	1	Cashier

3.0 - 3.9 — Service Occupations — Total = 468

304.884	2	8	Laborer
	3	4	Laborer
	7	12	Public Works Worker, Park & Courthouse Main.
304.887	2	3	Yardman
	3	1	Laborer
	5	4	Utility (b)
	7	2	Grounds Keeper, Laborer
	9	2	Yardman
306.878	8	1	Horsetrainer
	9	1	Day Matron
311.878	2	1	Cafeteria Employee
315.381	1	1	Matron and Cook
319.887	2	6	Kitchen Helper
	9	1	Kitchen Aide
321.138	4	4	Housekeeper, Hospital Housekeeper
323.887	8	2	Horsemaker Aide
331.903	2	4	Teacher Aide
341.368	2	2	Rec. Facility Attendant, Rec. Personnel
	3	1	Rec. Facility Attendant
	4	2	LPN Nurse, Mental Health Rehabilitation Aide
	5	1	Maintenance Attendant
	7	12	Rec. Facility Attendant, Rec. Personnel, Maintenance Employee
	9	2	Recreation Facility Attendant
354.878	4	2	Health Dept. Assistant
355.078	4	6	Nurse, School Nurse, Outreach Worker, Orderly
	8	1	Outreach Worker
355.087	4	1	Nurse Health Aide
	8	4	Nurses Aide
355.878	4	22	Nurses Aide, Dietician Aide, Orderly, Hospital Attendant, Training Aide-Mental Health
	9	4	Ambulance Driver, Ambulance Attendant

Table 3 (continued)

D.O.T. No.	Public Service Number	Total No. Requested	Position Titles
359.878	2	6	Teacher Aide
	9	1	Teacher Aide
360.281	2	2	Carpenter Repairman
361.887	4	2	Laundry Worker
369.877	8	1	Social Services Aide
371.783	3	1	Bridge Attendant
372.868	1	2	Turn Key Officer
	3	1	Meter Attendant
373.868	1	1	Correctional Officer
373.884	6	1	Fireman
	9	1	Custodian
375.138	1	1	Police Clerk
375.168	1	10	Sheriff's Deputy
375.268	1	20	Narcotics Investigator, Deputy Sheriff, Constable, Patrolman, Public Safety Officer
375.868	1	1	Correction Officer
376.808	1	2	Patrolman
376.868	1	102	Deputy Sheriff, Patrolman, Dispatcher, Public Officer, Trooper, Policeman, Law Enforcement, Deputy
	3	1	Patrolman Trainee
	5	1	Patrolman
	8	8	Police Trooper
	9	2	Patrolman
377.868	1	18	Deputy Sheriff (male), Deputy Sheriff
378.879	5	1	Dog Warden
379.368	1	4	Radio Dispatcher
379.878	1	1	Dog Catcher
	5	1	Dog Warden
381.887	2	1	Janitoress
	3	2	Laborer
382.138	9	1	Maintenance Superintendent
382.884	1	4	Janitor
	2	65	Janitor, Yardman-Janitor, M.M., Library Custodian, Custodian, Bus Driver-Custodian
	3	18	Building M.M., Custodian, Janitor
	4	3	Janitor, Maintenance (Med. Care Facility)
	5	4	Janitor, Custodian
	7	3	Maintenance Man
	9	46	Maintenance Man, Custodian, Janitor
383.884	1	1	Security Maintenance Man
	3	1	Maintenance Man
	5	3	Janitor
	9	5	Night Custodian
389.381	9	2	Maintenance

4.0 - 4.9 — Farming, Fishery, Forestry and Related Occupations — Total = 7?

404.884	5	6	Tree Trimmer, Tree Pruner
406.884	7	1	County Park Laborer

Table 3 (continued)

D.O.T. No.	Public Service Number	Total No. Requested	Position Titles
407.134	7	1	Park Maintenance Supervisor
407.181	5	2	Sanitary Landfill Attendant
407.868	7	1	Maintenance Man
407.884	2	10	Grounds Maintenance, Grounds Keeper, Landscaper
	3	22	Grounds Keeper, Solid Waste and Recycling, M.M.
	4	4	Grounds Keeper
	5	4	Grounds Keeper
	7	6	Grounds Keeper
	9	4	Maintenance Man
407.887	2	1	Grounds Keeper
	7	4	Collection Curator, Park Playground Caretaker, Recreational Worker
409.484	5	1	Tree Trimmer
424.883	3	4	Equipment Operator
469.885	5	1	Sanitary Fill Dump Operator

5.0 - 5.9 — Processing Occupations — Total = 8

509.887	1	1	Cook's Assistant
	2	2	Asst. Cook, Hot Lunch Cook
589.887	2	5	Garage Maintenance, Maintenance Worker, Warehouse Maintenance, Maintenance Asst.

6.0 - 6.9 — Machine Trade Occupations — Total = 17

609.884	3	2	General Laborer
610.000	2	1	Night Custodian
620.281	2	4	Bus Driver, Mechanic, Bus Mechanic
	3	4	Auto Mechanic, Truck Mechanic
633.281	2	1	Office Machine Repairman
638.884	3	3	General Maintenance
	9	2	General Maintenance

7.0 - 7.9 — Bench Work Occupations — Total = 1

740.887	2	1	Painter

8.0 - 8.9 — Structural Work Occupations — Total = 186

806.887	9	1	Equipment Repairman
829.381	3	1	Equipment Operator
829.887	3	1	Electrician Helper
844.884	3	1	Cement Mason
850.887	1	1	Laborer
	3	47	Laborer, Road Laborer
	9	4	Laborer
850.883	3	2	Sanitary Landfill
859.883	3	1	Public Works Equipment Operator
860.128	2	1	Instructional Maintenance
860.137	2	1	Carpenter, Labor Foreman

Table 3 (continued)

D.O.T. No.	Public Service Number	Total No. Requested	Position Titles
860.281	9	1	Carpenter
860.887	3	4	Carpenter
861.381	2	1	Brick and Stone Mason
862.381	2	1	Plumber
	3	12	Maintenance Man, Public Works M.M.
	5	1	Maintenance Man
869.381	2	1	House Builder
869.884	3	12	Laborer
	9	3	Laborer, Brush Cutter, M.M.
869.887	3	2	Sanitary Maintenance Attendant
892.228	2	1	Teacher Aide
896.884	2	1	Building Trade and Maintenance
899.133	3	1	Crew Leader
899.137	3	1	Airport Manager
899.381	2	15	M.M., Painter-Custodian, Operations and Maintenance, Maintenance & Grounds
	3	19	M.M., Equipment Mechanics Asst., Public Works Maintenance Man
	4	1	Hospital Maintenance
	7	3	Caretaker
	9	3	Maintenance Man
899.884	2	2	Bus Driver
	3	34	Mechanic, Truck Driver, Highway Aide, Dept. of Public Works Laborer, Highway Transport Aide, Laborer
	9	1	Maintenance Man
899.887	3	4	Community Custodian
	9	1	County Building
9.0 - 9.9 -- Miscellaneous Occupations — Total = 115			
905.883	3	5	Truck Driver, Truck Operator
906.883	3	4	Truck Driver, Bookmobile Driver, Clerk
	4	1	Truck Driver
912.384	3	1	Airport Maintenance Man
913.463	2	2	Bus Driver, Bus Driver-Custodian
913.883	4	5	Emergency Ambulance Driver
929.887	3	1	Laborer
	5	14	Laborer, Dump Operator
	4	1	Sanitation Asst.
950.782	4	1	Sanitary Engineer
955.000	3	5	Road Repairer, Water Service
955.884	2	1	Maintenance Man
955.885	3	15	Sewer Service, Disposal Plant Operator, Asst. Operator Filtration Plant, Treatment Plant Attendant, D.P.W. Laborer
	4	1	Sewage Plant Operator
	5	7	Sewage Plant Attendant, Waste Water Plant Attendant, Sewage Plant Operator, Asst. Sewage Plant Operator
	9	1	Sewage Plant Attendant

Table 3 (continued)

D.O.T. No.	Public Service Number	Total No. Requested	Position Titles
955.887	3	47	Street Cleaner, Public Works Trainee, Laborer, Sewage Plant Attendant, D.P.W. Surveyor Draftsman, M.M., Public Works Truck Driver
	4	1	Asst. Sanitarian
969.387	7	1	Custodian Supervisor Recreational Bldg.
979.381	1	1	Copy Camera Man Apprentice

---

* Public Service Numbers which are based on the industry location of the occupation are as follows:

(1) Law Enforcement
(2) Education
(3) Public Works and Transportation
(4) Health and Hospitals
(5) Environmental Quality
(6) Fire Protection
(7) Parks and Recreation
(8) Social Services
(9) Other

Table 4

Education Level of E.E.A. Participants (5% Sample)

Education Level	Frequency	% of Total	Race and Sex
0-6	1	1.4%	Am. Indian - male
7-11	18	25.0%	White - 15 males; 3 females
12	43	59.6%	White - 32 males; 9 females Black - 1 male Am. Indian - 1 male
13	3	4.2%	White - 2 males; 1 female
14	2	2.8%	White - 1 male; 1 female
15	1	1.4%	White - 1 male
16	3	4.2%	White - 2 males; 1 female
17	1	1.4%	White - 1 male

Table 5

Weeks Unemployed of E.E.A. Participants (5% Sample)

Length in Weeks	Frequency (No. of Participants)	% of Sample Population
0-4	21	29.2%
5-9	15	20.8
10-14	7	9.7
15-19	4	5.6
20-24	4	5.6
25-29	5	6.9
30-34	5	6.9
35-39	1	1.4
40-44	1	1.4
45-49	0	0
50 or greater	9	12.5

Questionnaire to Sample of Persons Involved in
Administration of E.E.A. in "Balance of State Michigan Counties"

1. To what extent did you really need aid in planning and applying for funds?

2. Is there a planning commission for the agent? Did this commission become involved in the decision-making process for allocating funds? If so, in what way?

3. Who was the catalyst for initiating the requests--an individual or a group?

4. Were there any particular areas of the decision-making process or allocative process where help was needed more than in others?

5. Were there any problems in applying for funds?

6. How did you determine which jobs were to be made available? Did you make any surveys? Was the decision an individual decision or a group decision? Or were requests taken into a central agency from various others? Pt.--what procedure did you follow in order to assess your community's needs?

7. Did you use any public employment service, your own files, rehire or use a private employment agency to find people to fill your available positions?

8. Were there any positions you were unable to fill? If there were, why were they unable to be filled?

9. What has been the impact on the community? Have there been any special or outstanding effects as a result of the E.E.A.?

10. Did the positions really fill a community need?

11. Did these jobs result in any benefit to the community?

12. Were new areas for public service to the community opened or were these positions already in existence but unable to be financed with local funds?

13. What is your overall impression of this program?

14. Do you feel you have placed the right people in the right jobs?

15. If you could do it over again, would you select the same occupations to be filled or would you aid for different ones? Also, if you had had more time to choose the occupations, would you have changed your choices?

16. Do you approve or disapprove of the handling of this program?

17. Do you think the program can be improved upon to better suit the needs of rural areas? If so, why?

UNEMPLOYMENT RATES
FOR MICHIGAN COUNTIES
FEBRUARY 1972
UPPER PENINSULA
12.6%
MICHIGAN
8.6%
14.6%
9.3%
11.1%
12.7%
18.4%
11.7%
9.4%
16.6%
26.5%
21.9%
26.3%
31.3%
8.1%
14.1%
25.5%
13.9%
10.1%
13.3%
12.8%
16.5%
18.6%
18.7%
14.0%
14.4%
21.3%
11.5%
18.6%
14.5%
12.2%
21.5%
12.0%
17.3%
31.6%
9.0%
21.2%
22.3%
14.2%
10.0%
12.8%
15.8%
16.2%
13.9%
16.6%
11.8%
14.7%
5.6%
13.9%
7.9%
20.4%
7.0%
14.1%
10.9%
8.6%
5.9%
8.7%
8.1%
10.6%
6.5%
6.9%
5.9%
9.4%
13.6%
8.1%
13.0%
10.4%
10.4%
13.9%

A COMPARATIVE STUDY OF PUBLIC SERVICE EMPLOYMENT IN RURAL CALIFORNIA: A PROPOSAL*

Varden Fuller**

Hypotheses and Purposes

The underlying hypothesis of this study is that the vitality (degree of purposeful self-determination) of a unit of rural government (county or city) is likely to be reflected in its interest and capability to employ public service personnel. This is especially true in the "developmental" categories, such as planning and industrialization, and is also true in those services that relate to attracting and retaining productive human resources—education, recreation, child care, public health, and environmental controls. A contemporary question immediately related to this hypothesis is whether the opportunity being presented by the public employment program (PEP authorized by the Emergency Employment Act of 1971) is being utilized effectively to promote the vitality of rural local government. At one extreme, PEP could be used as a routine income transfer to unemployed persons; at the other, PEP could be an important means for local governments to enhance their vitality. How much of the latter is being done?

Immediately, one needs to recognize that in such a research project the "Heisenberg Principle" is likely to operate; the fact of the research being done may influence the behavior being observed. Nevertheless, if observation of behavior leads to better results, the outcome is not all bad provided the researchers are aware of the interreactions they may have invoked.

---

*Instead of presenting a paper, Dr. Fuller has written this proposal. He currently is conducting research on the PEP program in rural California. At the time when the proposal was written, these were his ideas.

**Varden Fuller is Professor of Agricultural Economics, University of California, Davis.

The proposed research would relate to counties having less than 75,000 population and to a sample of selected towns in PEP's "balance-of-state" for California.

Procedures

From counties and towns, data will be obtained on "normal" public service employment levels and expenditures by categories[1] prior to PEP (September 1, 1971).

After first round of PEP (April, 1972), we will obtain employment and expenditures data by categories for "normal" public service employment and PEP slots filled.

After a year of PEP (April, 1973), we will again obtain employment and expenditures data by categories and will then identify individual transition from PEP to "normal" employment. For comparisons between rural and urban areas, we will obtain the above data for Sacramento, Stockton, and Fresno.

Sources of Data

"Normal" employment and expenditure (wage bill) data would be obtained by questionnaire from local authorities. PEP data can be obtained from regular PEP reporting forms at either state, regional DOL, or Washington DOL levels. Relevant available supplementary data—population levels and change rates, income and wealth levels, industrial composition, county balances of payments, and the like—will aid in interpretation. The availability of the CES data for Madera and Merced Counties may warrant extra development in those counties.

Results Expected

With data such as above mentioned, a multitude of comparative analyses can be carried out that individually and in the aggregate should have

---

[1]Possibly omitting road construction or other similar services usually arranged by contract.

significant implications. Some comparative measures of public service (quantity and composition) are:

(1) Inter-rural, pre-PEP.

(2) Ditto, with adjustments for population, direction, and rate of population change.

(3) Ditto, adjusted for level of wealth and income.

(4) PEP with "normal" employment for any or all of the above.

(5) PEP_1 with PEP_2 for any or all of above (how much change evolved in the year?).

(6) "Normal" before vs. "normal" after PEP for any and all of above.

(7) Rural vs. urban, for any or all of above.

(8) Such other analyses as suggest themselves as the study proceeds.

The two most significant questions that ultimately should be answered for the study population are: What profile and intensity of public service employment appears to be related to rural local government vitality? and Is PEP contributing to greater vitality of rural communities?